

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Held on

Wednesday, 9th November 2016

At

THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
CIVIC HALL,
LEEDS

In the Chair:

THE LORD MAYOR
(COUNCILLOR G HARPER)

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

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

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF LEEDS CITY COUNCIL
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 9th NOVEMBER 2016

THE LORD MAYOR: Good Afternoon everyone. Don't all shout at once! Can I welcome you all to Council. Just to remind you all it is being webcast, as we all know, and also that Made in Leeds will be filming after tea for some reason – I do not know why.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE LORD MAYOR: We have got some announcements. Just to remind you all that Friday is Armistice Day where you will be free to join me down at the War Memorial in Victoria Gardens at 11.00am. As well as laying the traditional wreath I will also be laying a special commemorative wreath at the Leeds Pals Monument in recognition of all those who lost their lives at the Battle of the Somme. There will also be the usual Remembrance Sunday service where, again, you are welcome to join me, meeting here in the Civic Hall at 10.30.

It is with great sadness that I have to notify you of the recent death of former Lord Mayor Dr Graham Kirkland, who passed away on 15th October 2016. Graham served his community for over 40 years in Otley as a GP and as a Councillor and many of you will remember him with the great honour and pleasure he took in being Lord Mayor during his term of office in 1998/99. A service of thanksgiving was held at Otley Parish Church on 28th October 2016.

I also would like to notify you of the death of Dr Makhan Thakur. Dr Thakur represented the Aireborough ward from 2002 to 2004. Can you please join me in a minute's silence.

(Silent tribute)

ITEM 1 – MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 14th SEPTEMBER 2016

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 1. Councillor Ogilvie.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

ITEM 2 – DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

THE LORD MAYOR: Has anyone got declarations of interest they would like to declare who has not already done so. No.

ITEM 3 COMMUNICATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Communications – Chef Executive.

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

ITEM 4 – DEPUTATIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Deputations.

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE: To report that there is one Deputation from a group wanting to raise awareness in respect of the Richmond Hill Primary School Fuel for Schools scheme.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I move that the Deputation be received.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: I second that, Lord Mayor.

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

DEPUTATION ONE – RICHMOND HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL, FUEL FOR SCHOOL

THE LORD MAYOR: Good afternoon and welcome to today's meeting. Please now make your speech to Council, which should last no longer than five minutes, and please begin by introducing the people in your Deputation.

MR N ATKINSON: My Lord Mayor and fellow Councillor, my name is Nathan Atkinson and this is my colleague, Kevin Mackay. I am Headteacher at Richmond Hill Primary School in Leeds and am here to tell you about a project that we started over a year ago and you may have heard referred to as Fuel for School.

Richmond Hill Primary School is just outside the city centre, for those of you who do not know. We are a three form, large primary school with over 650 pupils on role. It is a very diverse school, we have 48 languages spoken in school. In terms of deprivation Richmond Hill serves one of the most deprived areas of the city and the challenges that we face in school are considerable.

In October 2014 I had been at the school for just over a month and on completing a rigorous evaluation of the school one thing that stood out to me was that children were coming to school hungry, many children were saying that they arrived without having breakfast, some even without food from the previous day.

Globally we spend millions and millions of pounds of public money on teachers' wages, we focus on a good curriculum, we focus on good quality of teaching and yet we still end up at times with results that are not good, that are less than good.

I acknowledged that hunger was a barrier to learning and the efficiency of this money that we are putting into the good quality of education is affected by these children who are just not ready to learn and not ready to engage in learning so as the Headteacher I vowed to do something about it. I set out and did three key things. We built a café in school; we changed the timetable; and we investigated food waste.

We built a café, which is a community based café in an under-utilised space in school and we open our café to the community two days a week between half-past eight and half-past ten. Families can come in, they can engage with a variety of different agencies and through our café we have really engaged with families and built some very strong working relationships.

Having identified hunger as a barrier, we changed the start of the school day. Having previously been in a school that was in special measures and a school that required improvement and manage to get both of those to “Good”, I had this School Improvement Plan that was literacy, numeracy, literacy, numeracy – we tried that and it toppled over and so we restructured the start of the day and bought toasters for every single classroom and provided the first lesson of the day to be breakfast. We feed our children every day and they do an emotional register, and it means that we are addressing the basic needs and trying to support children to be in a place where they can learn more effectively.

I was determined to do this at minimal cost so started to investigate food provision. In doing that I met with Adam Smith, who created the Real Junk Food Project. The Real Junk Food Project, which you may be aware of, gets surplus food and makes it available to people, so that the bread that we provide our children with every morning is surplus bread. When you talk about surplus stuff you might think that it is a mouldy old loaf but actually some of the stuff that comes into school is fresher than you will get off the shelves in the supermarket.

We set up a partnership with Hovis and we go to Hovis twice a week and we take their surplus stock and we feed 600 children every morning for free, so that made it a sustainable project.

We continued to investigate food and we set up a market stall that is at our school gates every Friday morning and our community are able to come and make donations and pay as they feel for the food. People said if you leave an honesty box outside in LS9 it will get stolen, people will take your money. We trust our community and we have built that trust. The only problem we have with our donation box is that people bring it in and say “Don’t leave that outside, somebody will steal it!” (*laughter*) In terms of building community relations this has been very positive for us.

Wanting to be proactive in engaging with other schools we did an Awareness Day and in December last year we offered to feed children across Leeds. On 8th December we fed 10,000 children one morning using surplus food (*applause*) and the feedback was overwhelmingly positive with Headteachers getting in touch saying “How can we do this more often? We want to do this.” In partnership with the Real Junk Food Project we sat down and have created Fuel for School. We had created it to address that barrier to learning which we identified as hunger but formally now we have Fuel for School which is now serving 36 schools every week across Leeds, so

there are 36 schools with market stalls, 36 schools that get a weekly supply of food for their communities.

Schools are wonderfully creative places; we provide the food, they do amazing things. One school feed their chickens with some of their food and they have used eggs and bananas to make banana cake. The power of food and the power of food that the system had deemed unfit for purpose in improving relationships with our community has been overwhelming.

Currently we are working with three universities who are going to do an evaluation of the project. They have seen the value in it and have bid for £700,000 to be able to do a three year study, and the study is not to look at educational outcome; it is to look at community.

We run this project 52 weeks a year. If you look at the resource as a school city-wide...

THE LORD MAYOR: Could you just wind up, please, you have had your five minutes.

MR N ATKINSON: Thank you. Do you want me to carry on?

THE LORD MAYOR: Carry on – finish off.

MR N ATKINSON: I will do, sorry. We run this 52 weeks a year because we have identified holiday hunger as a huge issue so in the summer holiday, our community days, we fed up to 900 people a day for free using surplus food and again the engagement, the social cohesion, the ways that our community is working together is just overwhelming.

We are here today to share the story. We have received national press and it is coming on national TV in December. We wanted to share this with Leeds because there is a lot of interest and to say please support us in any way you can. (*Standing ovation*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you very much. Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I move that the matter be referred to the Acting Director of Children's Services for consideration in consultation with the relevant Executive Member.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we have a vote? (*A vote was taken*) That is CARRIED. Thank you very much for coming today.

MR N ATKINSON: Thank you for your time. (*applause*)

ITEM 5 – REPORT ON APPOINTMENTS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 5, Report on Appointments. Councillor Ogilvie.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Catherine Dobson.

COUNCILLOR C DOBSON: I second, Lord Mayor.

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

ITEM 6 – REPORT ON LEEDS AWARD

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 6, Report on the Leeds Award. Councillor Graham Hyde.

COUNCILLOR HYDE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. On behalf of the Leeds Award Panel I would like to move that Dr Kevin Grady receive the Leeds Award for his work in regards to heritage and preservation in Leeds.

Just a quick résumé, Lord Mayor, because we have got a packed agenda. Kevin has for 30 years been a Director of the Leeds Civic Trust, is the founder member of the Blue Plaque Scheme and many colleagues in here will have seen them all over the city, is an ambassador for Leeds in his role in regards to heritage and in regards to conservation. He is well respected in the region and nationally and has links all over the place, is involved in setting up many groups, particularly around conservation and preservation but is a great ambassador in terms of the history of Leeds. Many people who are on Planning will know him very well for him being very vociferous but the other side of Kevin is that lots of people do not know that he does lots of work without any recourse and is a great educator basically around history, Lord Mayor.

I would like to move that Kevin Grady receives the Leeds Award. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I second, Lord Mayor .

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

ITEM 7 – REPORT ON AMENDMENTS TO THE EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 7, Report on amendments to the Executive Arrangements. Councillor Ogilvie.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Catherine Dobson.

COUNCILLOR C DOBSON: I second, Lord Mayor.

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

ITEM 8 – REPORT ON TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY UPDATE
2016/17

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 8, Report on Treasury Management Strategy Update. Councillor James Lewis.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Adam Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I second, Lord Mayor.

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

ITEM 9 – REPORT – PLANS PANELS ANNUAL REPORT

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 9, Report – Plans Panel. Councillor Richard Lewis.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Adam Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I second, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor McKenna, Jim.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: Thank you, Lord Mayor, and I am absolutely delighted to see you so well and sitting in that Chair today.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: Long may it continue. Lord Mayor, I am speaking on the Plans Panel Annual Report. I am really pleased to be able to talk about the work of the City Plans Panel last year. I take this opportunity, actually, to pay tribute to the Councillors who sit on the Plans Panel. We have four new Members and they have hit the ground running on some very, very difficult planning applications we have dealt with. I have to say, although it is all party and there is no politics in Planning, we have some excellent contributions from other parties and I think we work very well together and we are also served by excellent officers. I

would just like to say that on record, thank you very much for making my job as Chair easier than it could be on that basis.

As you know the City Plans Panel has consistently demonstrated their commitment to ensuring that the internal quality of new residential accommodation meets the Council's city aspiration in terms of living space, layout, daylight and outlook matters, particularly in high density schemes.

In this respect they refused an application for a student housing proposal at 46 Burley Street, and the decision was upheld in September 2015. This and other similar decisions and comments on proposals presented to the Panel is helping to push the agenda for high quality housing as the city grows and meets its housing needs.

City Plans Panel has been instrumental in adding value to the quality of design and architecture that is coming forward on regeneration sites. For example, City Plans comments on proposals for the residential proposal at Otter Island and for the university Law School led to design revisions which have resulted in a ward winning architecture.

It has also supported officers in delivering and negotiating outstanding development, such as the Leeds Southern Station, Sovereign Square, Victoria Gate (now open) and offices and green space at MEPC site and Central Square on Whitehall Road.

City Plans Panel deals with the most strategic and major application and meets more often than the other Panels – we do this every three weeks so it is a big workload for Councillors on this Panel. The Panel has dealt with a significant workload which reflects the relative buoyancy of the Leeds economy and development market. For example, one Panel on 24th March 2016...

THE LORD MAYOR: Time is up.

COUNCILLOR J McKENNA: Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Caroline Gruen.

COUNCILLOR C GRUEN: Lord Mayor, I am speaking on the Plans Panel Annual Report. Having chaired the South and West Plans Panel over the last two years I welcome this report, the first of its kind to be published in Leeds. It gives me the chance to emphasise how crucial the role of the Plans Panel is. The decisions made by Plans Panels are real and genuine and because they are not usually subject to any other forum, they have immediate effect. Decisions are formed through live interaction between Members, residents and developers and whilst few decisions can please everybody, these discussions in my view reliably result in the right thing being done for the city.

The way Plans Panels are conducted is open and transparent. Applications involve public representation and each item is considered for as long a time as is necessary to make a full evaluation of all the planning material considerations.

Of course, the vast majority of applications that are considered by South and West Panel are controversial or difficult in some way, or they would not be coming to

Panel. Like any group I often ask myself what value the panel adds to each decision. I would like to give this example of how the combined perspectives of each set of stakeholders can lead to a change in outcome.

In considering an application for the redundant White Bear restaurant in Tingley to be redeveloped as a Drive Thru McDonalds, the Panel had some reservations on the recommendation to approve, particularly around highways issues and the additional noise and movement drive thru arrangement would cause. These were then substantiated when Members visited the site. In the ensuing Panel discussion both the Members and the officers were of the view that the Panel's concerns probably did not amount to a sound planning reason not to approve and that any such decision would be likely not to stand up to appeal. Having listened to the views of residents, including those working at an adjacent secondary school, the Panel nevertheless felt so strongly in principle that this development was unsuitable for this location that they unusually took the risk of overturning the recommendation and losing at appeal.

McDonalds, of course, did go ahead with the appeal which was, to everyone's surprise, ultimately dismissed by the Inspector and so the development remains unbuilt, so Panels can make a difference.

There are many other examples of where the Panels have a positive and creative influence, as has been mentioned, on design, materials, massing and dominance, and in one case earlier this year the Panel successfully prevented the demolition of a listed building within the curtilage of Arthington Hall.

Can I take this opportunity, Lord Mayor, to thank Planning Officer colleagues for the high quality and professional support they give to the Panel which they have managed to sustain despite reducing and constrained budgets. I should also like to thank all Members of the South and West Plans Panel for their excellent contributions and professional approach.

There are many Members of the Panel with a great deal more experience in Planning than me and I thank you very much for sharing that positively and creatively and bringing it to inform our work. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Neil Walshaw.

COUNCILLOR WALSHAW: Thank you, Lord Mayor and, as with Councillor McKenna, it is a pleasure to see you back in the big chair there.

I would like to add my voice to those welcoming this report. It is really detailed, it is really informative and it is also, if you look at it, a way that elected Members can really influence the development of our city and our communities. As I have said before in this Chamber, planning decisions really can last absolute lifetimes.

I have to say I take the opportunity to thank all the officers for all the work they do and, as Councillor Gruen has said, their budgets and time are constrained and I would like to thank all elected Members for your contributions and the amount of effort you put into the fact that you have gone through everything in detail, you come to Panel and you want to make a positive contribution; that includes even you, Councillor Procter. I am literally sharing the planning love today, really!

It is true, we are a detailed Council and as elected Members we do all the things in real detail. I think that is very much to our credit, Lord Mayor. I have never seen a planning application – and I also have the pleasure as well of chairing North and East Plans, I sit on City Plans under Councillor McKenna and I have never seen a planning application that has not benefited from the care and the attention and the duty of care that elected Members in Leeds put towards this work. We have seen some excellent, excellent work this year.

It is also testament to the fact that the sheer amount of investment interest in the city is remarkable. We had a barrister come up to talk to us about various other issues (and we might even touch on those issues later on in the White Paper section) and she was saying that in the south-east and in London decision-makers in investment circles after Brexit, a bit dicey about London, but not about Leeds, Lord Mayor. We have got an enormous amount of interest in this city and I think that is excellent.

If I was going to pick a theme this year I think it would be, to coin a phrase, extensions, extensions, extensions. We are doing a lot of extension work on North and East Plans Panel and I think that maybe that is reflected in house prices and the issues that surround house prices, and I think that is something we have to be mindful of as elected Members.

I would finally just say that there is a lot of contention, shall we say, around planning issues and nothing is so bitter as a planning dispute and I think as elected Members we have all seen that, but there is – and we should not lose sight of this, Lord Mayor – at all times we are trying to build communities and there is, and I have said it before in this Chamber, there is something a little bit joyous when we give Planning Permission and you see the look on people's faces that they are going to see their dreams realised. We see that on North and East Plans, we see that on South and West Plans and we have see it on City Plans. Thanks, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Barry Anderson.

COUNCILLOR B ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I do not disagree with a lot that has been said but in referring to this Plans Panel Annual Report I am going to break the consensus that has been coming forward.

In his introduction Councillor Lewis says that it is essential that officers and Members and communities work well together to deliver the growth needed in Leeds. I do not disagree with that. However, the implementation and communication of this to some of these participants is leaving a lot to be desired. Who knows best what is for a ward? The ward Members and when we bring something to the attention of officers, in particular, they have got to start listening more because we are on the ground. They have got to start reflecting back,

We also made great play of the fact that there was only four applications, contrary to officer recommendations. As someone who has tried to convince officers otherwise, I would be as well just banging my head off a brick wall half the time because they just do not listen to what is going on.

What about looking back at some of the enforcement cases? I see in here that there is going to be a review next year of some of the applications that you have allowed and some of the disasters that you have allowed to take place. It would also have been nice to have seen more in the report about enforcement action, or rather the lack of enforcement action in a lot of places throughout the city, because it really is becoming a problem, the lack of the resources being put into enforcement and the problems that this is causing.

There is also a lack of attention being paid to residents' views as well. Residents are taking the time to express their views and concerns and it is sometimes very difficult for them to express it in front of Councillors and we need to give a little bit more weight to some of the comments they are making.

I am also told – I was not at the Joint Plans Panel when this was discussed – that there is concern about the number of Councillors asking for applications to come to some Panels. Why is that? It is because some of us do not have any confidence in the way that the system is and the only way that we can ensure that a fair hearing is given to some of the applications, we have got to take this opportunity.

What I would say in conclusion is you can do better, you can improve in that we work together but – and a theme that I am going to return to throughout the rest of today – complacency is becoming the watchword of this administration. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Tom Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, the Plans Panel Annual Report has a few bits that need highlighting. Firstly on page 61 it is claimed that the City Council's New Homes Target is 66,000. Actually it calls for 74,000 new homes to be built leaving a net gain of 70,000 after 4,000 demolitions. This is not a quibble - 74,000 is 8,000 more than 66,000; at ten to the acre if they were built, 8,000 houses would swallow up 800 acres of green belt or urban green space which is likely to be noticed even if spread around the city.

Although the numbers surrounding housing need and supply are fairly straightforward, few seem to know or understand them. As Leeds begins its inevitable retreat to a more realistic target, perhaps 50,000 new homes by 2028 as argued by ourselves in Morley, more will have to come and understand those numbers whether they like them or not.

Secondly, the poster, or whatever it is on page 63, says that four Panel planning application decisions went against officer recommendation in 2015. One of those was McDonald's Tingley White Bear and we thank Members of all parties on Plans Panel South and West last December who stuck out for a refusal despite being berated behind closed doors for about half an hour by officers who wanted to let the application through. This let us live to fight another day and defeat a slightly different version of McDonald's plans at public inquiry in March and that seems to have marked a turning point in the city's dealings with planning and public health aspects of hot food takeaways.

Thirdly, on page 64 it is stated that only 2.2% of all planning applications in Leeds went to Panel in 2015/16; the rest were determined by officers. There is a

DCLG recommendation that officer delegation should account for 90% of determinations, so 97.2% perhaps shows a democratic deficit. There should be more scrutiny by panels, even randomly chosen conservatories and house extensions, so that Members can understand the local interpretation and application of changing national policies and guidance and assure themselves that everything is being done consistently.

Finally on page 67 the revival of the useful Joint Member/Officer Working Group was welcomed. It had lapsed for about two and a half years. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Colin Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. For those Members who have not had chance to glance at this document I would recommend it to you because it does give an excellent outline of the work that officers and Members do in Panel to ensure both quality and appropriate development in Leeds.

There are a couple of areas of particular interest though for me. Firstly, it just shows how important pre-application discussions have become to produce quality developments. It is an area which Panels have some success in, I think. Secondly, it also highlights the increased use by developers of District Auditor to attempt to reduce any contribution they may wish to make to the greater good of the city.

Perhaps if it has a fault it is the lack of photographs. I do not usually agree with the principle that you put Plans Panel Chair's photograph in a document but there are one or two more photogenic Members of Panels (*laughter*) who could perhaps do that. In particular, I think perhaps more appropriately it would be useful, I think, to have photographs of some of the developments that the Panels have dealt with and have been a positive gain to the city. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. The next two questions are withdrawn. Councillor Richard Lewis to sum up.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think it is quite appropriate that this item comes just after we have talked about Kevin Grady getting the Leeds award, because it is not so many years ago that the Civic Trust seemed to criticise every single major building that went through our Planning system and I think it is actually a tribute to the Plans Panels in part that we have a very good relationship with the Civic Trust and generally our planning activity is seen as positive to the city.

I was talking to the architect of the new park on Sovereign Square at its opening a couple of months ago and he was very keen to say that it was the positive process of going to a Plans Panel meeting and discussing his proposals that actually made the plans better. I think that is very much how we are often seen in Plans. I say "we" – I should not say "we" because I will never be a planner but I have a huge amount of time for all of the Members of Council who do put so much effort into planning, some who are gluttons for punishment – Stuart, where is he, who will not only go to one Plans Panel a week but will probably get in three if he possibly can. All those meetings are about attention to detail and a real concern about the look of

the city. I think it is a tribute to the work of Plans Panel that the city is looking so much better and has the kind of iconic buildings in it that it does.

Barry, I am sorry you are not a happy man but I think you were commenting not about the Plans Panels so much as probably people like me, which is fair enough. Tom, can I thank you – every time you are asked to speak about planning you always talk about housing numbers (sometimes when you are asked to talk about anything), but planning you will still talk about housing numbers, which I think is a great achievement.

Putting that aside, I would again say this is a tribute to the effort that is put in by people in this Chamber over many, many years. I think you do a fantastic job and I think we look forward to further work over coming years that will cement what has been done so far. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

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

ITEM 10 - QUESTIONS

THE LORD MAYOR: Item 10, Questions. No more than 30 minutes. The first question has been withdrawn. The second question, Councillor Brian Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Does the Executive Member share my disappointment at the failure of Horsforth School's bid for a sixth form facility on the former Leeds City College site in my ward?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thank you, Councillor Cleasby for your question. Just very briefly before I answer could I take this opportunity to draw Members' attention to the fact that we have a new Leeds Children's Mayor. The winner was announced last night, we had a record number of applications and I just want to raise this now because we actually have the manifestos of the shortlisted candidates on display in the ante-chamber and I would like to encourage all Members to take the opportunity today to take a look at those manifestos. The winning candidate was Grace from Drighlington Primary School, so I think we would all like to be welcoming her at a future Council meeting where she will be presenting her manifesto formally to us.

To respond directly to the question. The Education Funding Agency, or EFA, approached us twelve months ago as they were seeking to speculatively purchase sites in areas of anticipated growth for pupil numbers with a view to future free schools opening there. Can I just apologise, I am full of cold, I am struggling a little bit to speak. We put it to them that both Seacroft Hospital and Horsforth College sites were likely to meet that criteria and where the Council would otherwise be unable to secure land due to the lack of funding provided.

The initial bid for Horsforth Academy was for a 1,200 place post-16 free school on the former college site and we provided a letter of support for that bid. The bid was a mixture of Level 3, A-level and vocational courses. We are told by the

EFA that the feedback to the academy was to remove the vocational elements and to focus on Level 3 where the school had a strong history of successful delivery. It is our understanding that that bid was amended in line with the feedback and was resubmitted in September's part of the wave 12 applications, again with a letter of support from the Council.

The school has had constructive discussions with one of their nearest neighbours, which is Benton Park, about the free school providing a joint sixth form offer for both schools serving a wider community. If successful, the moving of the sixth form provision to the new site would free up additional capacity in both the existing schools for 11-16 year olds, capacity that will be needed in the north-west area of the city. Horsforth School regularly sees their young people achieving good outcomes in sixth form and we welcome their interest in serving a much larger number of young people and support them to achieve those same high standards. Thank you. (*applause*)

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

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Yes, Lord Mayor. Thank you, Lord Mayor. By way of supplementary can I ask the Executive Member if she was aware that there had been freedom of information requests to find out the Council's prejudicial involvement in the first place?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: I am not aware of any such freedom of information requests, Councillor Cleasby. All I can say is, as I said previously, we have continued to support the application by Horsforth Academy to open a free school on that site because of the need for additional provision in that community to serve both the communities of Horsforth and the Benton Park area.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Christine Towler.

COUNCILLOR TOWLER: Please could the Chair of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority Transport Committee update Council on the Combined Authority's West Yorkshire wide transport consultation?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Keith Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am delighted to be able to report that on the West Yorkshire Combined Authority we have had 5,000 people respond but even more pleased to say that in Leeds alone we have had over 5,000 and the consultation period has not ended.

I think given the political mood as mentioned today that it is important to listen to people, important to be seen to respond. I think we have to take this consultation extremely seriously so I was extremely frustrated when I got a five page letter from Greg Mulholland MP well before the consultation has ended to tell us that we are virtually wasting our time consulting the people of Leeds. I quote:

“When it comes to a mass transit scheme it is not a long and open conversation we need; it is leadership and a plan we can all get behind and make happen.”

All of us in this Chamber – well most of us in this Chamber, sorry Tom – really wanted a mass, fast transit system in this city but the problem with this proposition, it has fundamental flaws. Firstly, the £173m should go on the scheme. We could debate that, we will do I have no doubt next Council, but if you go for a fast, mass transit scheme you will need, even with a good wind behind you, over ten years to get the resources, the legislation, the public inquiry and all that that needs doing. There is not one in this country that has been done under ten years.

The suggestion that we could spend the 173 has a real problem. Firstly, by the time we get round to the time period where we will no longer have the money it will be 2025, so in fact what he is suggesting is that we should sit back, do nothing, not look at other things and actually wait for a scheme that we will actually run out of time for with the money. A rather reckless suggestion.

I think there are two other big problems with this. One, we are consulting people across West Yorkshire and Leeds and the whole of the city on all the modes of transport – on bus, rail, bike, walking, car. That is what we are consulting and we are actually consulting all the city, so to suggest that we should just put it in his favourite order – I look at Ryk because he knows exactly what I am talking about – he will back any transit scheme but guess what, he has got a transit scheme for the Leeds/Bradford airport along the Leeds/Harrogate/York line.

I think that is a gross insult to the people of Leeds who all expect their concerns to be addressed and not one area. I think it is the right thing to do, that the right thing to do is to consult, the right thing to do is look at all options of improving transport and the right thing to do is to include all people of Leeds in this debate.

I found out the other day, dare I say this, that I think we have got two Greg Mulhollands in this city. *(laughter)* I never believed this. We have got a Greg Mulholland on 12th July that said it was his idea and he supports the NGT and then we have another Greg Mulholland on 20th October who says “I was never in favour of it.” It cannot be the Greg I know! I move, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Towler, do you have a supplementary?
No. Councillor Tom Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: Would the Executive Board Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning please tell us how many planning applications were referred to Plans Panels in the 2015/16 municipal year, and of those how many were referred by officers and how many by Councillors?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Council had a total number of applications determined in 2015/16 of 4,384 of which 144 applications went to the three Panels for determination; 70 of these were referrals from elected Members.

Member referrals accounted for 66% of the applications for determination on the North and East Panel agenda and 49% of the applications for determination on the South and West Panel agenda. There were no Member referrals on the agenda of City Panel in that year.

The remaining 74 applications going before Panel for determination were applications which could not be delegated, that is those falling into the exception categories in the Chief Planning Officer's Delegation Scheme, a small number of applications going to Panel for determination even though they could be determined under delegated powers, for example landmark buildings, setting a precedent or due to their sensitivity.

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

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: No, thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stuart McKenna.

COUNCILLOR S McKENNA: Can the Executive Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning update us on the recent decision from the Secretary of State on Grove Road?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In June 2016 the City Council received a decision from the Secretary of State that an appeal at Grove Road, Boston Spa, had been allowed. Because the decision was the complete opposite to the Secretary of State's and High Court decision at Bagley Lane, the Council has tried to challenge the decision in the High Court. On 17th October the Council's renewed application to challenge this decision was dismissed. We have subsequently received further advice not to proceed with any action in that we would get absolutely nowhere with it. Clearly a disappointing outcome for the Council and the implication of the decision is that the Secretary of State has found that the City Council does not currently have a five year supply of housing land within the context of National Planning Guidance. The City Council is also awaiting the outcome of other planning Section 78 appeals on these issues.

The Council is taking a series of positive and proactive steps including a wide range of initiatives already under way. Clearly we need to prioritise the regeneration of brown field land across the city and the management of housing growth and deliveries through a planned approach to provide the homes we need. The Council's brown field land programme, the private sector acceleration programme and Council house building programme are all important in their delivery, as are the decisions of Plans Panel on key brown field sites within the city centre and inner area – for example, in novel forms of development such as the large scale build for rent schemes.

The Council has already submitted the Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan for examination and intends to submit the Site Allocations Plan for examination in the first quarter of next year. As well as dealing with the merits of site specific applications, the Council is also committed to review the Core Strategy Housing

requirements with a report to be considered at the next meeting of the Development Plans Panel which is 22nd November, setting out the approach and timetable.

At a national level the Council is continuing to press the changes to the planning system to ensure that it is locally led and focused on meeting local priorities, needs and circumstances rather than top down and one size fits all. *(applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR S MCKENNA: No.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ryk Downes.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Lord Mayor, would the Executive Member please explain to Council why Members are unable to give MICE money to the Yorkshire Air Ambulance?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Thanks for raising this, Councillor Downes. I will work swiftly to a resolution to this and inform you in due course. I will sort it out, Ryk! *(laughter)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Have you got a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Lord Mayor, that answers my supplementary, thanks.

THE LORD MAYOR: That was it. Councillor Lamb. Sorry, I missed that.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We got there eventually. Is the Executive Board Member for Children and Families as concerned as I am about the fact that across the whole of Yorkshire, Leeds had the joint lowest level of seven year olds reaching the expected standard in reading and writing this year, and for the sake of your cold “yes” or “no” will be just fine!

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Councillor Lamb, I am grateful for your concern. Of course we are concerned, we share your concern. However, our drive to ensure that every child in Leeds has the opportunity to go to a good or outstanding school means that 95% of our primaries are outstanding or good. That is the highest percentage across the Yorkshire and Humber region.

That said, Leeds is below where we want it to be on a national scale. Attainment at the end of Key Stage 1 is below national with 65% of pupils meeting the expected standard in reading, 54% in writing and 64% in maths and our Learning Improvement Team has already taken a number of actions to achieve our vision of becoming the best city for learning, working with our schools to improve those outcomes. These include increased assessment packages offered; work with Learning Alliances focused on improving outcomes for pupils and showing that data analysis is a key priority; increasing support for the most vulnerable schools; reshaping our

programmes in light of the 2016 outcomes; and closer working with our education partners.

THE LORD MAYOR: Any supplementary:

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. The former Director of Children's Services said he was surprised by these results. Was the Executive Member surprised as well and if so why doesn't she know what is going on?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you again, Councillor Lamb. These are the first results since changes to how children are taught and assessed against a controversial more challenging national curriculum, one introduced by the Government, and it has been regarded with disdain nationwide by those working in education. Government advice – that is Government advice, not my advice or the Council's advice – is that these results should not be compared to last year's results but instead used as a new measure going forward.

Sir David Carter, the National Schools Commissioner said:

“I would like to reassure you that the Key Stage 2 results ... do not mean a significantly larger proportion of schools being classed as below the floor. A primary/academy will only be judged to have performed below the floor targets if they have failed to meet both the attainment and progress elements. We would not typically expect to intervene on the basis of 2016 outcomes only.”

The other thing I would say is that the statistics also highlight the significant challenges that a number of young people in our city face. Some of them were highlighted today in the Deputation we received from Richmond Hill Primary School, such as the significant number of children who live in poverty in Leeds and the number of children starting school with English as an additional language.

I think our schools and teachers do an incredible job and we are not complacent but will continue to work with them and all of our schools to ensure that all of the children in our city get the best chance for their education. (*hear, hear*) (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Alex Sobel.

COUNCILLOR SOBEL: Following the Government's announcement regarding Clean Air Zones, can the Executive Member for Environment and Sustainability tell us what the Council is doing to tackle poor air quality?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lucinda Yeadon.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Thank you very much. As Council will be aware from briefings which we have circulated, Leeds has been identified as one of five cities as well as London which would be required to establish a Clean Air Zone because of concerns around air quality in the city.

This is something as an administration we absolutely acknowledge and accept that air quality is a challenge and something that we need to do all we can to improve.

As a Local Authority we have identified improving air quality and cutting emissions as one of our breakthrough projects and we currently have a cross party working group which is overseeing that breakthrough project, and I thank Members who take part in that, to look at the strategies that we need to work towards to improve air quality.

We will be launching a publicity campaign and an air quality pledge in the next few months with the aim of engaging with businesses and organisations across the city. People can sign up to the pledge and target their own emissions because we recognise as a city is not just about the Council doing something to improve this problem, it is the city as a whole.

This will feed into a wider aim of communication and engagement to raise the awareness of air quality issues. Tomorrow I am actually visiting Shire Oak Primary School as part of School Green Week as it is part of their ambitions to establish air quality awareness in their school also.

In more practical terms we are increasing the number of corporate fleet vehicles that are being replaced with zero or ultra low emission vehicles and we project that we will have over 100 on the fleet by the end of the current year. I had the privilege of driving one of our electric vehicles around the city the other week and I now have a certificate to say so, and I am sure if you would all like to take that opportunity Terry at Fleet Services would be very keen for you to get involved.

We have secured funding from the Go Ultra Low Clean Bus fund which will enable hybrid buses to be used at the new park and ride scheme. The new Bus Technology Fund also allows the installation of emission reducing retrofit technology in over 50 buses that operate in the Leeds region and we are looking at ways how we can shift people's vehicle use from cars into public transport as well as getting people on bikes and establishing the new railway stations at Apperley Bridge and Kirkstall Forge.

We also have plans to establish the UK's largest alternative fuel station which would provide the city's scale opportunities to commercial fleets and enable the conversion of 200 corporate vehicles to compressed natural gas from diesel.

I think as a city we do recognise that we need to do something to improve air quality and we will be working as hard as we can as fast as we can to get it right.
(applause)

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

COUNCILLOR SOBEL: Yes, I do. I am sure the Exec Member is aware that the Government's plan to tackle UK air pollution has been judged illegally poor at the High Court just last week. Does she agree with Mr Justice Garnham that Ministers knew there was over-optimistic pollution modelling based on flawed lab tests of diesel vehicles rather than the actual emissions, and also that initially the plans were to include 16 cities and then it was reduced to five just on cost grounds. What does

the Executive Member think of the Government's defeat and what plans should the Government now be making to support Leeds and those other cities?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Yeadon.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Wowzers! I think it was a damning verdict last year in the High Court and the Government has accepted it and I think now plans will need to be put in place to ensure that the air quality clean air zones that need to be established over the next year or so will be given the appropriate funding to do so, although I expect that other cities and other areas will be brought into those clean air zones. I think it is a significant ruling, it is not the first time in the past year that a court has ruled against the Government on its air quality plans in place.

We will be looking at how can we lobby Government to ensure that they put practical measures in place so that the cities that do have to have clean air zones can achieve them in a reasonable time frame, so we will be looking at putting together an ask for Government for them to recognise some of the challenges that we have.

We have already secured some funding that will go towards establishing a clean air zone but we do know that a lot more has to be done and we cannot just rely on the pot of money that has already been identified if more cities and larger areas are going to be included in these clean air zones.

We are taking this challenge incredibly seriously and we appeal to the Government to take the challenge seriously as well. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Bob Gettings.

COUNCILLOR GETTINGS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. There is increasing concern about the number of people begging in the city centre. Could Council be advised about the legality of begging in the city and, more importantly, what is the city doing to help the people who find themselves in that position?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Debra Coupar.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Thank you, Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Gettings for raising awareness of this issue that we have got in the city currently. Like many other cities Leeds has problems with people who beg and who approach members of the public asking for money in both passive and aggressive manners. We are very aware of the impact that street begging can have on those living, working and visiting Leeds and we take this issue very seriously.

At the same time, Leeds is a compassionate city and people who beg often have a variety of problems relating to mental health and substance misuse. We do not aim to criminalise everyone found begging and have stayed away from arresting people for begging as the first choice of action, preferring to engage, offer support and warn individuals where appropriate. However, begging is a crime and can be intimidating. Aggressive and persistent behaviour is antisocial and has to be addressed.

The West Yorkshire Police Initiative to deal with begging in Leeds is called Project Verto. Under Project Verto a person begging is initially offered a warning,

explaining where and how they can get support including help with accommodation, free food, shower facilities, dry clothing, help with benefit claims and help support for drug or alcohol issues. If the same person is sighted begging again then further action is considered which may require that person to leave the city centre for 48 hours. If an individual again breaches the terms of the order, then it is likely that they would be dealt with more formally, arrested and legal action taken.

We are currently pursuing enforcement action via a criminal behaviour order, which is deemed appropriate to deal with harmful, aggressive and persistent antisocial behaviour where all other approaches have been exhausted. We work very closely with our partners including West Yorkshire Police, the wider Council and a number of organisations and charities such as St George's Crypt, the Big Issue, In the North, St Anne's Resource Centre, Grow Live Change, Simon on the Streets, Housing and Drug Alcohol Services and Business Against Crime in Leeds. In partnership we try to persuade those found begging to take up the offers of help and signpost them to relevant support services. Those who refuse initial support are then discussed at a multi-agency case conference to facilitate robust managed intervention. Cases are monitored closely to ensure that support offered is proportionate and relevant to the needs of the individual.

A minority of people who beg are without accommodation. Where this is the case offers of emergency accommodation are made with further support given to achieve a permanent tenancy. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gettings, do you have a supplementary?
No. Councillor Josie Jarosz.

COUNCILLOR JAROSZ: Can the Executive Member for Health, Wellbeing and Adults comment on the Government's recent announcement of cuts to community pharmacies?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Charlwood.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor and thank you, Councillor Jarosz, for raising this very important issue. This indeed is the cut to community pharmacies, which are vital community services for many people, especially if they are living in rural areas or out of the way areas. It could be their only public service really that they have got locally, especially for elderly people and it could cause particular issues for those groups.

Funding for our community pharmacies, of which we have 180 in Leeds, will be reduced by 4% for this year. Starting from 1st December 2016 the 4% cut will be taken in its entirety over four months of the year to end of the budget year, so pharmacies will effectively experience a 12% pay cut in that period. This will be followed by a further cut of 3.4% for 2017/18, reducing the funding nationally to £2.592bn.

We in the Council expressed our strong opposition to the proposed reduction in funding for community pharmacies through a letter submitted as part of the National Consultation Exercise in March 2016. This letter prompted a response in May 2016 from Alistair Burt, the Minister of State for Community and Social Care, stating that proposals for community pharmacies were intended to, quote, "put

pharmacy at the heart of the NHS and provide a better, more integrated service for patients and the public.” Despite this reassurance the proposals are still concerning as there is potential for pharmacies to close or levels of services to be reduced as a result of these plans. It is not really clear yet how many pharmacies could potentially close or what services might be affected here in Leeds as a result of the funding reduction, so we will consult with NHS England and Community Pharmacy West Yorkshire to try to gain a better understanding of what the impact might be locally for our communities.

Additional indications are that pharmacies could start to restrict services that they are not contracted for, or the ones that they have to subsidise, which will affect our constituents clearly.

Some of you may remember the White Paper debate a few months ago in this very Chamber on this issue and it seems yet again that this will be another example of the Government failing to listen to the real concerns and calls of our communities across this city and beyond. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Jarosz, do you have a supplementary? No supplementary. Councillor Barry Anderson.

COUNCILLOR B ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Is the Executive Member responsible concerned that despite efforts by the Administration, residents still don't understand why Forestry are unable to prioritise tree works to improve the quality of life for residents?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Yeadon.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Thank you, Councillor Anderson, I was not sure whether we would actually get to this question.

I first of all thank you for acknowledging that we have gone to efforts for trying to communicate with residents around forestry and tree works. As you will remember, in May Executive Board took a report around how do we ensure that trees that are impacting on private residents and businesses would be able to contribute towards the work for those trees and that was in an attempt to try and address some of these concerns that you have raised. If those messages are not getting out we certainly we need to look at that and I will absolutely take that back.

As you will know, the budget around Forestry has been reduced because of the cuts to the Local Authority generally and we do prioritise trees which are first of all unhealthy and need dealing with and those that are causing a health and safety issue and that is very much our tree policy.

It is a robust system and the Executive Board report in May was clear around that system, but if the communications around that is not getting to local residents, that is something that we will look at.

I know, and Councillor Wadsworth has raised this issue with me in the past and I have asked for it to come to the next Community Environment Champions meeting which I think has already been organised for December so that we can have a

proper conversation and if we need to look at how we are getting that message out, then we can do so.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Anderson do you have a supplementary?

COUNCILLOR B ANDERSON: Basically what I was going to say was, one of the problems, will you review the administration fee that you are going to charge people for this work, because some people who are capital rich but revenue poor are finding it very difficult to be able to find that amount of money. That applies in your area as well, if you actually paid attention to some of your residents. Will you undertake a review to look and see what can be done for those people who cannot afford the administration fee?

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Yeadon in return.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: I have no problem in taking that back and having a look and making sure that we have got a fair charge and we will bring the policy to the next Champions Group meeting and have a look at it properly together. Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, that is the end of Question time.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Page 12, Item 11, Minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Board. Councillor Blake.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ogilvie.

COUNCILLOR OGILVIE: I second, Lord Mayor.

Health and Wellbeing Board

THE LORD MAYOR: Right. Health and Wellbeing Board, Councillor B Flynn.

COUNCILLOR FLYNN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It is nice to see you back on this side of the Chamber as well.

I am speaking today on Minutes 24 and 25, commissioning issues on the wider determinants of health care, of course, fully embedded in the Sustainability and Transformation Plan which is due out I think sometime this week. I am concentrating today on the need for a meaningful communications and consultation strategy, the subject that has been debated many times this year including in this Chamber.

Before moving on to that subject I would like to express my strong support for the future of my own strategy, also mentioned in the Minutes. I know we all

appreciate the value of the cluster system to the social, emotional, mental health of our young children and young people, so I noted with some disappointment that at least one cluster has decided to opt out of the system as a result of the change in funding formula next year.

I do hope this does not signal a threat to the cluster system as a whole and I would be very grateful for some reassurance on this from the Lead Member for Children's Services.

Back on the consultation front, I said in this Chamber in September that the earlier version of the Leeds STP emphasised that everybody in Leeds had a part to play, residents and services together, involving the whole city. Similarly, previous Board minutes also indicated plans were being prepared for discussions with the public and local healthcare professionals. This was echoed at a recent Scrutiny Board by the author of the Leeds Plan, bearing in mind that this involves almost one million people in the Leeds area.

In the high level overview of the Leeds Plan provided recently to Members – thank you, Rebecca – there is mention of the shared responsibility and clear communications and engagement. By contrast, the next steps of the section of the same document indicate a phased communication plan to be enacted by December next year. Really? December next year? This is really unacceptable.

In a covering email Rebecca mentioned the lack of engagement with Members thus far in the process and I have to say that is absolutely spot on. I know that the Scrutiny Board and I have mentioned many times how essential meaningful consultation is to the success of the plan and had a discussion about it over the last 12 months, and I know that Peter Gruen has also written recently to the author of the West Yorkshire and Harrogate STP on a similar vein.

I appreciate the huge amount of work that has gone into producing the Leeds Plan over a very short time frame and I know how much personal commitment Matt Ward and his team have poured into it but I have to say that the reason why so many problems arise, even with the best laid plans, is the lack of a simple communication plan.

We are facing one of the most fundamental changes in the NHS and social services provision since 1948 and we cannot afford to get it wrong, so can the lead Members assure us that a comprehensive communications and consultation strategy involving everybody concerned with this will be delivered quickly. Thank you very much indeed, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Before I start, Lord Mayor, there is a small error here. I am actually speaking on Minute 24 page 70 and Minute 28 page 72.

On Minute 24 page 70, I would like to comment about the commissioning and decommissioning and I find it heartening to see that the CCGs are taking Leeds City Council as an example of best practice in this. I think we might possibly question that

a bit later in the Council today when we are going to have a little discussion about something bordering on that.

However, I do hope that it is a sign that Leeds City Council and the CCGs and NHS are moving a little bit closer together because that can only be good for our residents, for people generally.

Then to come to the Director of Public Health's Report. As a Leeds person, born, bred, educated, lived here, I think it is one of the best places on earth and I think that the health of the citizens is in very, very good hands in Leeds. If you are going to get something bad you could be in a jolly sight worse place. Then we come to public health, which is subtly different – a lot more wellbeing comes into that. I just wonder why, in a place that is so wonderful as Leeds, Leeds is actually worst in the league tables for adult deaths attributable to the air pollution, drug misuse is above the rate, teenage pregnancy is above the rate, one in three children aged five or more have tooth decay and sexually transmitted diseases are way above the norm.

This is not the city I think I was born into and live in and I really do think that the situation there and those sort of things that we are talking about, air pollution – we are talking about building 70,000 more houses; with the cars that come with it pollution is going to go shooting up and we are going to have much more stress in our population. I do think that whilst the Director of Public Health himself is not going to go and do anything immediately about this, I do think this calls into question the Health and Wellbeing Board and what it is intending to do. I do really think that it is going to have to address these shortfalls if we are going to do anything about the fact that if you go from South West Leeds to North East Leeds you find a ten year difference in life expectancy. In a city like Leeds that is not acceptable, Lord Mayor, and so I will leave it there. Thank you. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Terry Wilford.

COUNCILLOR WILFORD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I want to focus on Minute 25 on pages 72 to 74, staying focused on the wider determinants of health, in particular the Leeds Anti Poverty Work Programmes and the services in place to help and support adults and children living in poverty.

We need early interventions to tackle health inequalities across the city, signposting of services available for people in need. One in five children in the city are living in poverty. We need to ensure that we take the Leeds Health and Wellbeing Strategy forward, especially in these times of austerity and financial hardship. We need to reach out to communities and individuals to support their health and wellbeing. There are so many ramifications for people living in poverty – isolation, physical and mental health issues, some people are living at crisis point and some families are just getting by.

We need to work with our partners to offer support and inclusion and monitor whether individual needs are being met. We need to achieve ambitions to create a better life for all individuals within our communities. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Eleanor Tunnicliffe and it is a maiden speech.

COUNCILLOR TUNNICLIFFE: Thank you, Lord Mayor for the opportunity to speak on the paper focusing on the wider determinants of health. I say thank you but I am slightly downhearted already that my maiden speech is going to be associated for ever with the election result in the US earlier this morning but I will plough on regardless.

If we are to tackle the great health inequalities that we have in our city then we must tackle poverty, as poverty is one of the key causes of ill health. We have already heard from Councillor Latty about the ten year difference in life expectancy between someone living in Harewood and someone living in Hunslet. This Council is working hard with its NHS partners to tackle those inequalities by aiming to improve the health of those in our poorest communities the quickest.

The Leeds CCGs are developing social prescribing programmes to help improve health and to do this by tackling poverty and also social isolation. Those programmes are very innovative because they allow GPs not only to prescribe your traditional medical treatments but also to prescribe activities from getting some advice on your debts to singing in the community choir. I am not sure that would help my own health but I am sure it will help the health of other people.

Many of you will be thinking perhaps ahead to this evening and your own journeys home, bearing in mind the cold weather that we have with us today, the snow we had this morning, but I am confident that each of us when we open our front doors and step over the threshold will be greeted by warmth of our own homes. This is not the case for very many people who live in the city of Leeds. One in ten households in Leeds suffers from fuel poverty so one of the things the Council is doing is working with CCGs through its Warmth for Wellbeing programme to introduce small changes in people's homes, things like introducing draught excluders and pipe lagging to make sure that they can live in warmth and be healthier as a result. That scheme is also helping residents with advice on their heating bills and encouraging them to do things like switch supplies so that they can keep their heating costs down.

We have heard already today from the Headteacher of Richmond Hill Primary about the importance of food and the role that hunger plays and the impact that it can have on the education of our children and it is deeply worrying that many children in Leeds arrive at school in the morning feeling hungry.

Leeds City Council is working with its partners to deliver breakfast cereal to 6,000 children in Leeds. That programme is expanding and it will soon include the provision of fresh fruit as well thanks to a working partnership with one of our major food companies.

To me it is clear that we have a vast amount to do if we are to eliminate health inequalities in this city but it is also clear to me that this Council and its NHS partners are striving hard together and working creatively to achieve our ambition of improving the health of the poorest in our communities the fastest. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: The next two have been withdrawn. Councillor Ally Smart.

COUNCILLOR SMART: My Lord Mayor, I will be speaking on page 76 Minute 27. The Leeds Future in Mind Strategy brings together our response to recommendations from the Department of Health Future in Mind and its duties within the Children and Families Act in terms of the special educational needs requirements for pupils with social, emotional and mental health needs. This is the first time the Local Authority and the Department of Health have come together to form a joint strategy such as this. The strategy promotes the shared vision of a culture where talking about emotions and feelings is the norm and it is socially acceptable for us to acknowledge difficulties and ask for help.

Once requested, help is swiftly provided by people with the correct skills to offer that support. A central component of this strategy is listening to the voices of children and young people and their families. The strategy underlines the commitment to tackling mental health issues, specifically those among children and young people.

The Joint Strategy is challenging but it has been put together because we believe it is the right thing to do to ensure better outcomes for children and young people in this city. There is a strong emphasis on prevention, early intervention and the Invest to Save model. It is completely right that the mental health of children and young people is a priority, both within the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the Council's Children and Young People's Plan.

The Council continues to demonstrate its commitment to this, most recently through the £45m investment to transform specialist education provision within the city through a new multi-site academy under the Wellspring group. This will provide world class provision for some of the most vulnerable children and young people in our city and is something that I particularly welcome.

The three CCGs have invested the ringfenced funding allocated of around £1.5m to transform social, emotional and mental health support and services for children in our city. The Future in Mind Leeds Strategy is driven by a constant focus on the question what is it like to be a child or young person growing up in Leeds and how can we make it better.

This is a wide-reaching strategy which aims to support young people from birth to the age of 25 and includes eleven different priorities covering primary prevention through to specialist provision and from pre-birth through to transition into adult services. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stewart Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking to the Minutes that are referred to in the Order Paper. I just want to remind the administration opposite that it is good to have good intentions but it is also very important that you follow up those good intentions with clear priorities and that you make the right choices.

The Director of Public Health Report this year was comparing 150 years of public health in the city and you would hope to see that there was progress across most of the things that we have been asked to tackle as a Council because, remember,

we were at the front line in providing basic services which meant that everybody had access to clean water and a decent health system.

One of the things that we have noticed recently though is that actually a lot of these indicators that we measure our progress on we are not improving on and one of the key areas that we are not improving on is in terms of particulates and nitrous oxide. Not all of those are included in the report but particularly the particulates are which implies our air quality is not getting better.

It does not help, though, when the only question which is asked by the administration of their portfolio holder with responsibility for this is a self-congratulatory one talking about isn't it terrible how the Government is trying to impose something on us but they have been criticised because their plans are not good enough. Do you know what, we had plans which were adopted by this Council in 2011 by your administration which talked about getting a feasibility study together, about enacting our own low emissions zone, and you did nothing about it. That was the choice that you made and it meant that you are in a position now where even if it is not particularly good, the Government is still putting something in place in this city in spite of you that is better than what was there beforehand, so I do not think it is really a good place to be self-congratulatory in.

Councillor Tunnicliffe, that was a really good speech and first of all I would like to congratulate you on the fact that you can actually speak without a paper in front of you that has been written by somebody else, and I would love to see more of that from the benches opposite.

I am afraid that you will come with a lot of idealism and unfortunately you will discover that quite often the people that are on your Front Bench do not live up to what you hope of them. For instance, I will also make reference here to to the Leeds Let's Get Active campaign which was a Government initiative but the Council supported it and then later on decided to subsidise it and take it forward. The Council has now cancelled this programme.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: No, it has not been cancelled.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I appreciate the Council has less money and therefore it needs to prioritise where possible and sometimes you cannot prioritise all the things that you have actually committed to in the past...

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Maybe the Lib Dems do things like that.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: ...but they have done this in the context of prioritising £4m for Yorkshire County Cricket Club to build a new stand.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: How about the £100m Lib Dem cuts? How about the £100m Lib Dem cuts in the Budget? Talk about what your Government did to our Budget, Stewart.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: How can Councillor Tunnicliffe, as one of your back benchers...

THE LORD MAYOR: Time up, Stewart.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: I will sit down. Enough said.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: You have made your point, Stewart.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Charlwood to sum up.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor and thanks for finishing on such an excited note. I will go through the points in turn and then we will get to that one at the end at the end.

Thanks very much for all the comments. I would just like first to put on record congratulations to some of our partners in the city who sit on the Health and Wellbeing Board. We have had St Gemma's having outstanding rating from CQC and it is just so rare to get care home or hospice care rated as outstanding, so it was a wonderful, wonderful achievement so well done to that. LTHT Trust got a "Good" for their CQC rating which with such a large, the biggest in Europe I think, hospital trust is an outstanding achievement, so we noted that at the Health and Wellbeing Board as well.

Councillor Flynn talked about the STP consultation. Yes, I completely agree with comments made about the transparency and engagement. I think, yes, we are trying to be as inclusive in engagement with our part of the process as possible. I think it might be useful at this stage just to reiterate the Leeds Plan that we can have some governance over and engage on that, will start as soon as possible. The West Yorkshire STP decision making which is obviously less, we are not involved in that as much, certainly not politically, that follows a different time frame that we do not control but certainly what we do control locally we will start engaging on that as soon as possible, before December I would hope. I know there are plans in place already so hopefully we will get some information to you about that.

Councillor Latty mentioned the commissioning/decommissioning paper and how we are a good example of how we should be working in a joined up way and I think that is right, it is a real success of the partnership working we have got and I think we need to challenge the partnership to move forward with that as much as we possibly can and the more we can do about that together the better. If we can be unified about that, the better. We have got a lot we can share with our health partners to do the best for the city of Leeds and for the people that we represent.

I would just now like to turn to Councillor Tunnicliffe's comments. Thank you for your contribution in your maiden speech, you highlighted significant work which is already taking place through the city through our CCG partners and public health in addressing some of the impact on poverty. Ultimately to achieve the ambition set out in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and improving the health of the poorest the fastest, which I think Councillor Wilford also mentioned, we must continue to work together and support initiatives around social prescribing, income poverty, food and fuel poverty and help make the vision we have set for the city a reality.

Councillor Latty also made the point about public health that was related to that and I would also like to thank and welcome the 150 year historical report of

public health in the city by Dr Ian Cameron. It is a fantastic piece of work and a really useful resource to have.

Just on that I would say that yes, we have issues that we raised in that report that we can see we need to work towards. We certainly have progress towards most of those in a positive way. Most of the indicators were improving. There were the odd occasional ones that were not improving and we need to then focus on that, that is the purpose of the report and so we will take that forward.

Councillor Smart, a wonderful contribution, thank you for your contribution to the Future in Mind Leeds Strategy. Absolutely vital and pivotal to what we are doing in Leeds. It is really exciting. Future in Mind Leeds seeks to improve the social, emotional, mental health and wellbeing of our children and all our young people in the city by working collaboratively across health and social care. It is an issue that matters to young people so much and through consultation with them they have put it as their number one priority.

I would just like to say that the common theme highlighted throughout the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board was the strength of our existing partnership, actually, and the potential of our future collaboration. I will leave it there because I have run out of time. Thank you. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

Executive Board

(i) Health, Wellbeing and Adults.

THE LORD MAYOR: Right, Minutes of the Executive Board, Health, Wellbeing and Adults. Councillor Golton to move an amendment reference back.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am moving the reference back and also talking to some of the Minutes as well – hopefully I will fit them all in, especially since some of the arguments that I am using for the reference back have been used previously, especially in Executive Board.

Lord Mayor, I am referring this particular item back because I do not think that this is now the right time for the Council to be withdrawing from its direct provision of care services within the city. The Better Lives Strategy that we have in front of us is a living document and it started life quite a while ago and it is developing along the way. However, I would argue that it is not developing at the same pace as the changes that we are seeing both demographically but also in terms of how the market is changing in the provision of social care not just in the city but nationally.

I think we should respond to that because a lot of the presumptions that the original Better Lives Strategy had in terms of where we wanted to be once we had withdrawn from direct services, a lot of them are not there at the moment and that is due to changes in the market themselves, it is due to the introduction of things like the living wage but those pressures are there and it means that actually if our basic desire is the absolute best care for our people and not simply the bottom line in our balance sheet, then we do need to take time, pause and reflect and this is why this reference

back is in place, because we need to be able to develop a stable, mixed economy for our health and care in the city that prioritises and enables community generated and therefore community responsive and most of all affordable care. We will talk about this in greater detail later on, so consider that my moving for the reference back.

I would also like to turn to the issues – Councillor Charlwood gave a very good defence of why we need community pharmacies and if we lost those community pharmacies we would then be dependent upon large national brands and chains of chemists – I will not name them – to be delivering our pharmacy services in our city and surrounding market towns.

The reason why we do not want that is actually one of the same reasons why we should not be overly reliant on large national and international chains of care providers for our older elderly people, because community based operations are far more responsive, they are more bespoke and they are actually more flexible. It means that we do not just get a standard that one organisation is willing to deliver anywhere in the country – we actually have a standard which is set locally and that is one of the reasons why it is so important in the same way for Councillor Charlwood to listen in the same way that she wants the Government to listen about community pharmacies. I think this is a good time for us to pause and reflect. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Ann Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to second the reference back. I note that the residents of the Middlecross, Siegen Manor and The Green care homes have been promised alternative residential accommodation in localities of their choice which will be equal or better than the Council's own facilities. The fact is that all these Council care homes have been rated as "Good" when inspected by the CQC whereas there are too many private care homes which take dementia sufferers that are not so and require improvement. 49% of care homes and 67% of nursing homes within five miles of Middlecross require improvement; 50% of both care and nursing homes in the care of Siegen; and 58% of the care and 59% of the nursing homes in the case of The Green.

It has been claimed that some of the Council homes have toilets down the corridor and are outdated, yet in the case of Middlecross in Armley there is their own toilet and wash basin en suite, though the CQC do only state that en suite facilities should be supplied in new homes only. Surely it is the care and attention that is given by the staff that is the most important thing and many of the carers in these homes that have relatives in these homes have told me that our staff are second to none, which I know is true.

It has been said that the rooms are deemed to be too small for the staff to operate hoists etc but in fact they are no bigger or no smaller – in fact about the same size – as the rooms in a private care home where my mother-in-law has just moved into in South Leeds. The difference is in Middlecross's case that they have got three lounges where people can go and be quiet and just do work on their hobbies etc, give a lot of time to them, where this is not usually the case in private homes. Also, these residents can go across to the Day Centre and many of them do. Again, we do not have that in private homes.

Coming to the Day Centres, the nearest Day Centre to Middlecross is either Laurel Bank in Middleton or Calverlands in Horsforth. Laurel Bank had five vacancies and that was a couple of weeks ago mid week, and as far as Calverlands goes in Horsforth...

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blackburn, can you wind up please?

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: ...that is really too far. Yes, I will finish up now. I remember when they opened Middlecross how good it was...

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blackburn...

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: ...so can I just say that I am sorry that now they want to close them.

THE LORD MAYOR: Carry on.

COUNCILLOR A BLACKBURN: I ask you to support this reference back. Sorry about that. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Neil Buckley to move a further reference back.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I also propose a reference back. A few weeks ago some of us spent about seven hours at the call in meeting discussing all these care home issues and despite the result then the Executive Board has given the impression of simply wanting to plough on, effectively plough on with its closure plans.

The call in at the time sought to oppose the closure of The Green, Siegen Manor, Middlecross, Springfield and Radcliffe Lane Day Centres. Members also, including Councillor Collins, drew attention to the recent very poor handling of the Manorfield in Horsforth closure proposals.

The administration tells us it wants to save money and how much money would these proposals save? Just to home in on two of them, if you look at closing The Green that would save £366,000 at the current low occupancy rate, which is a key feature. Radcliffe Lane would only save £160,000 and what alternative arrangements exist to replace those services? All the homes and facilities slated for closure are rated "Good" by the CQC. Most of the alternatives available are rated either "Requires improvement" or "Inadequate".

We have sensible cross-party recommendations of the Scrutiny Board which have been ignored again but this is not just about money; this is about the quality of care for our elderly and vulnerable people. A half a million pound saving, it is a big number, it sounds a lot of money, but let us just remind ourselves that the revenue budget of this Council is £496m. The savings are relatively small.

Apart from all this we have a problem with what we are being asked to agree with because the Labour Group are asking us to accept what they are saying to us but which bit of the Labour Group is it? The Front Bench are saying various things, they want to close all these things, or is it the Labour Councillors who signed their own

call in motion – Councillor Catherine Dobson, Councillors Field, Groves, Walker, or Councillor Ron Grahame who signed the motion and then mysteriously unsigned.

COUNCILLOR P GRAHAME: No, he did not mysteriously unsign it.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: I thought they had locked him in the cellar for a few days but I am glad to see he is back there now.

COUNCILLOR P GRAHAME: Be careful.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Or their two colleagues who were not actually allowed to sign the form, or is it or should it be Councillor Mark Dobson and Councillor Truswell who voted with us against the closures?

COUNCILLOR TRUSWELL: You voted with us again.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: It certainly would not be Councillor Hussain and Councillor Pryor and Councillor Selby, who all voted in favour of the closures.

Who speaks for Labour in this but, more to the point, who speaks for the vulnerable and who speaks for the elderly and the marginalised...

LABOUR COUNCILLORS: I do!

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: ...because if they won't we certainly will. These people in the homes are being caused worry and uncertainty about their futures and it is not right, Lord Mayor. This is no way to treat them. The administration needs to get a grip on this and decide what it wants to say to us and do the right thing. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

COUNCILLOR P GRAHAME: You want to get your facts right.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lamb.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As Members here today will be aware the Better Life Strategy is fundamentally about the Council's drive to deliver a sustainable 21st Century approach to meeting the needs of people with care and support needs. Since the strategy was introduced in 2011 there have been two Directors of Adult Social Services, an Interim Director, four different Executive Board Members including myself who have led different phases of the strategy which developed over that period. The nature of care needs and the expectations of older people have changed significantly over time.

Older people want to remain independent for longer. On the whole older people require additional support at a later stage in life and it is a sign of the success of our health and care system that people are living longer, in many cases whilst managing a range of long term conditions. Additionally the extremely challenging

financial circumstances we face as a Local Authority demand that we respond to this changing landscape by adopting more efficient and effective models of services. Crucially, and this is important to make clear, we have never compromised on our commitment to ensuring high quality care both through our in-house provision and those we commission from the independent sector, and this will continue to be our approach.

Our fantastic Neighbourhood Networks are a key example of the way in which this Council is using its position to bring key services together to enable older people to live independently and to proactively participate in their communities. This is not about a single strategy to address a particular pressure, it is about adopting a holistic approach to an incredibly complex range of issues.

I am sure we will hear from some Members in this Chamber today that the motivations behind the current programme are entirely about financial reasons and the need to make cuts. However, let me be clear, whilst it might be politically convenient for us to say that or to make a sound bite to say it is all about Government funding cuts which are impacting all of our public services in this city so hard, it would not be accurate to say that that was the fundamental basis of this strategy, which aims to respond to significantly changing demographic needs in this century and the system we inherited from the last. It is just that we are having to do that in straitened financial circumstances.

I would like to close by making a few points about process. Over the last few years this strategy has been subjected to intense engagement and discussion and has not been rushed through. When I became the Executive Member for Adult Social Care last year the process was part way through a nine month pause. The pause was put in place to ensure discussions up until that point were robust and to offer further opportunity for staff members and trade unions to bring forward proposals that they thought would enable us to maintain these services in-house and make them sustainable. Indeed between January 2015 and July 2015 an additional seven meetings took place with union colleagues to talk through the process and explore alternative suggestions put forward by staff. This was alongside continued dialogue of families and carers which did in fact lead to changes being made to proposals that were brought to Executive Board initially in November 2014 and brought back twice already this autumn.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: I will just finish by saying that I believe that despite these incredibly difficult circumstances we have worked extremely hard to protect the most vulnerable and older people in the city and I hope that we can continue to do so. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Brian Selby.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor, the same Minute. Lord Mayor, the Better Lives Strategy is the Council's strategy for people with care and support needs and a key aspect of the strategy has been a strategic review of all the Council's in-house services for older people in a number of phases since 2011. Lord Mayor, so far as I can recall this is the first time I understand where there has been a

reference back or request from Opposition parties for a call in on any part of the strategy.

Lord Mayor, Councillor Mulherin highlighted in detail all the consultations that took place last year with the trade unions, with all service users and all the work that has been done.

Lord Mayor, there are four main drivers shaping these recommendations. Older people's wishes to have a wider choice of suitable accommodation and support options as much as possible whether it be at home or in extra care housing. Also we must take into account the challenging financial context for Local Authorities, the need for the most efficient and effective model of services to make the Leeds pound go further. The need for substantial capital investment in those buildings that are no longer suitable for the level of frailty and complexity and support need that we now see. When one takes, for example, some of the rooms in some of the homes there is no room for a wheelchair and a bed and any furniture. Those are the sort of issues that we are dealing with. Then there is the impact of older people exercising their choice which is now affecting occupancy levels in our care homes with day services and therefore the cost, and we have to take those into account.

Lord Mayor, phase 3 went through a very thorough and detailed process and again this has been highlighted. We have also had cross party call in meetings where the Executive has accepted recommendations. At the last call in both the Executive Member, Councillor Charlwood, and the Director, together with colleagues answered in very great detail all the questions raised by Board Members, a meeting that lasted well over seven hours; one of the longest committee meetings I have been in.

The Board was not unanimous to support the decision to refer back. I certainly took the view that there had been adequate scrutiny, adequate consultation and adequate clarification for the decision to proceed.

What is important is that we have also included the Care Guarantee, recognising the anxiety for both residents, families, carers and staff if a decision is made to close any other home develops with the Care Guarantee. The Guarantee demonstrates its commitment to support all those who are affected, that each person will receive the same level of service and commitment, that no resident will be worse off financially if they have to move...

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR SELBY: ...and all residents services - thank you, I will sit down. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Christine Macniven.

COUNCILLOR NACNIVEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I speak on page 79 Minute 60 and page 96 Minute 86 referencing the Better Life Strategy. The Better Life Strategy is the Council's strategy for people with care and support needs. A key aspect of this has been a strategic review of the Council's in-house service for older people. This has taken place in a number of phases since 2011.

As detailed in the September 2016 report to the Executive Board, Better Life Programme Phase 3 Next Steps and Progress Report, there are four main drivers: the aspiration for older people to have a wider choice of appropriate accommodation and support options (for example, support delivered in the home); the provision of increased extra care housing; the challenging financial context in which Local Authorities have to provide services; the need for an efficient, effective model of services to make the Leeds pound go further; the need for capital investment in buildings no longer suitable for the level of frailty of residents and the complexity of support need; the impact of older people exercising choice with regard to occupancy in care homes or using day services.

Actions to progress these drivers include a comprehensive and detailed cross-party examination of Phase 3, a call in to a cross party Scrutiny Board from which the Executive Board accepted recommendations. Commitment to driving quality improvements of Adult Social Care through accelerated engagement with the three Clinical Commissioning Groups, the Care Quality Commission and the sector itself. A strength based approach which has been developed to recognise variations in individual need; high, complex and moderate to low needs have been defined to ensure that services are available to help citizens remain independent, recognising the importance of what people can do rather than what they cannot. Recognising the strengths provided by family, friends, community support and the 37 extremely successful Neighbourhood Networks.

All of this in a challenging environment where Central Government support for Local Authorities had dropped by over £5bn in the last five years.

Richard Humphries, Assistant Director of Policy at the King's Fund says:

“It is demography-defying that spending is set to fall further when the number of those aged 85 and over will double in the next two decades and the number of adults living with a learning disability will increase by at least a third.”

All Councils are under huge pressure to find more efficient and cost effective solutions to these growing demand without sacrificing the quality of provision.

In 2016/17 Government responded to this need by providing the Social Care Precept...

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR MACNIVEN: ... and we all felt very excited but there is a national crisis of social funding and there is a need for the Government to respond immediately. Thank you. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Lucinda Yeadon.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It has been some time since I stood in this Chamber to talk about Adult Social Care but we knew six years ago when I was the Executive Member responsible that the challenges that lay ahead of us were huge with a growing older population, changing needs and expectations and with a Council budget which was decreasing we knew that something had to be

done if we were to ensure and maintain a sustainable social care system fit for the future.

Many Members from around this Chamber took part in looking at that strategy and a cross party working group worked very hard in establishing it at the beginning. The 2010 Scrutiny Board inquiry recognised no change was not an option.

This is not just the position that Leeds finds itself in but Councils up and down the country are attempting to find a solution to this very sensitive and complex situation. The Nuffield Trust, the Health Foundation and King's Fund estimate that there is likely to be an Adult Social Care funding gap of between £2 and £2.7bn by 2019/20. Successive Governments have tried to look at the issue but it often gets put in the "too difficult" box and even with the Adult Social Care Precept, this gap is not closing, yet Leeds continues to prioritise Adult Social Care.

When nationally Adult Social Care budgets have reduced in Leeds they have increased and now make up 40.6% of the total Council budget. As Councillor Mulherin says, this strategy is not just about the financial context, it is about providing services that people want for the future. However, having said that, for those families whose loved ones are in homes where the future is being discussed it is understandable that it is an incredibly worrying time.

Councillor Buckley, I do not believe that any Member in this Chamber takes these decisions lightly and we do all empathise with the family Members and carers who want the best for the people that they love, which is why ensuring that the changes are made in a sensitive and well considered way has been paramount throughout the past six years and we will continue to do so in the next phase of the process.

The service has developed extremely good practice over that time and Adult Social Care has supported and worked with 401 people with a range of needs over the past five years to move home or to change their day service. They continue to monitor and review individuals after the change was made to check on their health and wellbeing and of the people that moved, 79% said they were happy and settled in their new home at the three month review.

We do have examples of people who, although anxious at first about the change...

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: ...went on to have positive experiences as have their family and carers. I recognise and I think that we all recognise that for the people...

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR YEADON: ...whose families are affected, it is extremely worrying but it is really important that we get this right and not turn it into a political football. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Peter Gruen.

COUNCILLOR P GRUEN: Lord Mayor, we are standing in front of the crossroads. One way is a wide, easy road to travel. It is the road of blame, it is the road of name calling, it is the road of saying it is your fault or it is his fault or it is her fault or it is the callers-in fault, or it is even the fault of people who actually put a petition together. I tell you that road is a cul-de-sac because it has no answers, it has no solutions.

Come and walk with me on the other road which is narrow and steep and we will stumble together but it is the road of solutions. It is the road where we see the twin enemies that we need to slay with our trusty sword. The twin enemies: one is of under-performance consistent and persistent for years of the private sector homes and care homes. My God, if in schools we had 50% of our schools being either inadequate or not good we would have a revolution by parents in this city, so why are we not having a revolution if 50% of our care homes are inadequate or require improvement?

The second twin enemy is of the complacency that we do not, all 99 of us – not one or two or eight people but all 99 of us who make up this Council – say it is unacceptable, we need to improve massively the standards. As the traders in Kirkgate Market would say, we don't want 50%, we don't want 60%, we don't want 70% - we want 80% good or better than good.

Why? Why do we want 80% good? The answer my friends is not just blowing in the wind, the answer is simple. The answer is because our elderly people are worth it. They are worth it. They are worth having good care, they are worth being safe, they are worth being happy and, yes, they are worth having our and our officers, dare I say, emotional attachment not just professional obedience. Emotional attachment and some love, simply because they are worth it. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Andrew Carter.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. That last speech was very interesting, on all sorts of different levels. *(laughter)* Very interesting.

Let us get back to the issue before us. We have had two long question and answer sessions in two Executive Boards, Scrutiny we already heard, seven hours. The problem is, and I absolutely accept what Lucinda has said, this is not easy, this is not easy, there are issues to be resolved and they have to be resolved but you have to take public confidence with you and that you have singularly failed to do. Too many mistakes, too many changes of opinion, too many misleading comments.

I want to draw your attention to the Minutes that have come out today for the Exec Board on Wednesday, 19th October. Under this particular item there is paragraph (b) on page 4 which relates to The Green. It says – and you will have to read the whole thing for yourself and I strongly suggest you do:

“It is noted that the establishment of the new facility is subject to agreement with NHS commissioners.”

Absolutely correct, that was what was said to us and that is where it stopped. The Minute says:

“...and it also be noted that if such agreement was not reached the new facility was not progressed, then the current facility would need to be closed.”

I am sorry that was not what was said, certainly not in those terms it was not said. What was said was a further report would come back and be submitted to the Exec Board to update the Board on the transition of The Green to the new facility and also whether there are any issues with the NHS.

I believe that that Minute is incorrect. It does not accurately reflect what was discussed and I shall certainly be challenging it at the Exec Board. What that indicates to me is that there is something badly wrong with this whole process and it seriously undermines our confidence, and I absolutely accept that difficult decisions will have to be made, absolutely accept that – it undermines the confidence of this Council, it undermines the confidence of the people outside and particularly the families of the people we are trying to help here and the residents and the people attending the Day Centre in Pudsey.

It is not good enough. The impression has been given that you are a disorganised and shambolic rabble and that simply will not do. Two Exec Boards, a seven hour Scrutiny, Members signing things then not signing it...

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: ... being leaned on to back down. It is not good enough at all. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Billy Flynn.

COUNCILLOR FLYNN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I just first of all welcome some of the campaigners who performed extremely well over a long period of time in their efforts to keep some of those care homes open, notably The Green. It is lovely to see you here today.

I do sympathise with Adult Social Care in their efforts to square what is a very difficult financial circle. The Coalition pursued a similar path, I think as previous speakers have said, while in power and did try to counter funding pressures but at the same time trying to resolve the very difficult task of improving the quality of care in some homes which do not reach the high standards required in society today.

On this side of the Chamber we do appreciate the considerable funding pressure facing Adult Social Care and emphasised in the recent CQC and Local Government Association State of the Nation reports.

Unfortunately, we are very near to closing the last of the Council owned care homes in the city and I do wonder if we are in danger of throwing out the baby with the bathwater. Leeds prides itself on being a compassionate city and we are well on the way to achieving our ambition of becoming the best city in the UK, but there is a

danger that in planning the closure of the last of these homes which care for some of the most vulnerable adults in our city we may put that aspiration at considerable risk.

My approach to this issue has been consistent throughout. If it is absolutely unavoidable that some of these care home should close, then every one of the residents moved to other accommodation is entitled to as good as or better than they are receiving at the moment. That is the legal and moral responsibility of this Council. Unfortunately it is an unpalatable fact that the majority of independent care homes in the city providing broadly similar care to The Green, for example, almost 100 of them, the vast majority have been judged as requiring improvement by the CQC and that is just unacceptable.

There will be no winners here today but can we not just retain or think about retaining some of our excellent capacity for those with the most complex needs and the most difficult to meet. I would just like to echo Councillor Carter's comments about the paper that we passed back from the Scrutiny Board, a very long Scrutiny Board, which was not reflected accurately in the Executive Board Minutes. Thank you very much indeed, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Colin Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think it is clear to all of us, is it not, that the big health issue facing the country relates to the increasing number of older people and I think we have consistently over the years I suppose ignored it and hoped it would go away is perhaps the best way to describe it. Unfortunately it has not gone away and nobody seems prepared to grasp that really big nettle which is in the end we are just going to have to spend more money.

Having said that, this leaves the Council in a situation where it is faced with an increased demand but with a reducing provision and I think the big concern for all of us is that by in effect the Council coming out of the healthcare market, for want of a better word, we are pushing people into the private sector and, as has already been pointed out on more than one occasion this afternoon, the private sector cannot step up. The private sector has a very poor record at the moment in providing care for elderly people. Local Authority homes actually have quite a good reputation because I think the rationale behind a Local Authority facility, which is actually care for the people, is somewhat different to the rationale behind a number (I will not say all because that would be unfair, but a number) of private care homes, which is a profit based motive.

I have to say, the Council's policy in many ways seems to me a little like fire fighting – something happens here and so we deal with it, etc. I really am concerned that we are moving away from a provision that traditionally we have always provided and actually we are going to end up abandoning a number of our residents. I do not use the term lightly. I do not think we would do that willingly but I think actually in reality we will be abandoning a number of people who we have care for to a system which they do not understand and really just does not provide for their needs. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: The next four comments have been withdrawn. Councillor Ryk Downes. He is not here – you are doing it.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor. I am just getting over some laryngitis, it has been a very quiet week in the Lay family. Mrs Lay has had a rather nice time!

I shall be speaking briefly on Minute 60. Look, if nothing else the result of last night and the referendum should teach us that as decision makers we need to start listening to the public and to our members. Sometimes we get things wrong and rather than trying to save face or justify the unjustifiable we should admit it. On this occasion I think we have got it wrong because when both the voices of the community and of Scrutiny Board tell us to reconsider, perhaps we should.

As Stewart said, five years ago when the Better Life Programme commenced I suspect the Council thought the independent sector would be in a better position standards-wise than it is now. Progress under tougher inspections has been slower and patchy and we know the independent sector are struggling to raise standards, yet our own services have higher ratings, are loved and are grounded and placed in our communities.

Whilst those independent sector higher standards remain unmet, this Council should continue to deliver services. That is why the Scrutiny Board with cross-party voice urged the Council to hold off for two years. That is why relatives are concerned that the Council will ignore them and move frail, vulnerable customers and residents from the high quality services and care they currently receive – not because services elsewhere are better but because services elsewhere are cheaper.

For this reason alone I support the reference back. Thank you. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Brian Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillors may remember some time ago I asked the question of Council to simply get some information about the disparity between private contracts and Council contracts for Council provided domiciliary care. The difference, Alan Gay, you may remember, was actually £11m we could have saved. I put some imagination into the thought and the point is, there is no imagination in this.

I remember the attempt, Lucinda, when you tried to close Manorfields before and I remember, Councillor Ogilvie, when you appeared rather foolishly on a Labour leaflet saying you had saved it. It is rather a hollow leaflet now, isn't it? It is not imagination, it is a perfectly good home.

Council, whatever the Government does at the end of the day we are Leeds, they are our residents. Their children may be many miles away, cannot look after them and so it falls to us to look after them. We have seen and highlighted the problems with the private sector and the lack of care that may well be provided. Therefore come on, Labour Party, it is lunacy, it is arrogance to say it is not our responsibility to protect our residents. You, Labour Party, are the privateers in this. You are privatising a service that really, not by law but very morally, is our responsibility to provide for our elderly. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robert Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Clearly I am focusing on Siegen, there is a debate later on so we will deal with the specific issues at this particular point, but Siegen is the home of some of the most vulnerable members of our community at this is an opportunity to thank those residents and their families and the staff for continuing to campaign to keep this particular home open.

We have been very clear in saying that we are not Luddites who suggest that these homes should be kept open for ever and ever. We are suggesting a pause, a two year pause while something better is offered to these particular residents and we have suggested that two year pause and will do so later on.

We would also like to thank the residents of Morley who have come out in their hundreds to protect Siegen Manor. They see it as a genuine community asset and feel that their particular concerns and views should be taken into account. We would like to thank the MP who has backed the campaign, we would like to thank the Town Council and the Town Councillors as well but fundamentally this boils down to the issues of funding.

All political parties have refused to deal with this issue, this thorny issue of funding year after year after year, whether you go back to the Tories, the 1990s, the Labour Party who had 13 years to do something about it, to the Coalition. I never thought I would be standing here and saying at least George Osborne did something about it by allowing the Social Care Levy. It is a blunt instrument but it at least allows us to start to address the under-funding of Adult Social Care that has existed year after year after year while successive Governments of all persuasions have refused and avoided dealing with this thorny issue.

Councillor Campbell already points out, ultimately the issue is that we will have to dig deeper into our pockets if we are going to provide the Adult Social Care that is going to be required in the future.

I would also like to pass on my thanks to the Tories and the Greens and the Lib Dems who joined us with a suggestion that the thing should be looked at again by calling in this particular decision. We also thank the Labour colleagues who also attempted to do the same thing. It was regrettable that they could not get the right number of signatures at that particular point but we did note and we will be informing the people of Morley that Councillor Dawson was not one of those signatories who claims one thing and does another.

Ultimately we are in a situation at this particular point where you save £1.945m if you close these particular homes. Over two years that is just under £4m. You offered a £4m grant to Headingley Cricket Club. Is test cricket more important or defending some of the most vulnerable in our society? I am clear where we stand on this. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Shirley Varley.

COUNCILLOR VARLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am going to be quite brief. I am speaking on behalf of the citizens in our ward because it does affect Siegen and it is a community asset. It is at the corner of a sheltered housing complex and it is important that this particular facility stays open in some way.

I was going to speak first about the Better Lives Strategy but Councillor Golton in his reference back spoke about it more eloquently than I could do and I agree with him entirely on that.

I leave it at that for now but the thing is that we have to have a better way of looking at things. Things are needed. There was some discussion about en suites. This is a bit of a red herring. It is not the en suites that are important; it is the fact that people in elderly lives with dementia very often have complex conditions and they need equipment that they can use in order to get the best care that they need. I agree, I am supporting the reference back and I thank our Leader, Robert, for saying all those other things about the statistics. Thank you very much, Lord Mayor.
(applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor John Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillor Lucinda Yeadon is right, being in office is often about taking difficult decisions and, Lord Mayor, in 2004 when we and the Liberal Democrats and the Greens came into office there were a string of very difficult decisions that faced that incoming administration after 24 years of Labour control, not least of which were the issues around Adult Social Care. I can remember very clearly and very vividly a Cabinet meeting that was held where my colleague Peter Harrand brought forward a series of photographs, a dossier effectively of photographs and what it revealed was some of the shocking conditions in the care homes that the Council ran at that particular time. Councillor Harrand insisted that each of us who were in the Cabinet at that time visit a series of the homes to see the conditions that we were all responsible for and people were expected to live in.

So started a journey whilst we were in administration to try and modernise and update the facilities that we had but also to, yes, close some of those facilities. At every twist and every turn along that journey the Labour opposition shouted, screamed, mobilised everybody they could do including their union friends to oppose everything that we were seeking to do and, indeed, those calls were led by Councillor Coupar from these very benches.

Now you find yourselves in office with difficult decisions to make. However, things have changed and things moved on and all the Scrutiny Board was urging this administration to do and all we have urged you to do is to take a pause, have a look and the situation has dramatically changed and it has changed because of the provision currently on offer by the private sector. What is there now is not as good as it was and clearly something has to change. It is for those reasons that we collectively here and the Scrutiny Board made up of all parties originally said take a break, do not do this now. A call in was heard and again the same view was expressed, do not do this now. It does not do a lot for democracy to bring back straightaway in a hurried fashion a report to Executive Board and try to close these facilities. It brings no credibility whatsoever on this administration, Lord Mayor. Thank you. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Barry Anderson.

COUNCILLOR B ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. As I said earlier on, this is another example of complacency within the administration; this is another example of poor communication by the administration.

I was asked to speak to some residents from the west of the city – I am not going to mention whereabouts because they made criticisms of the way that they had been communicated to. They just did not understand what was going on both with them as carers and with the people that they were looking after, the people that were dear to their hearts, that they could see their lives being adversely affected and they felt nobody at that time was doing anything to try and arrest this problem. Nobody was explaining the alternatives to them. Nobody was speaking to the customers or the families themselves. They were just being left on their own. Nobody was even trying to set out and justify the benefits of what the administration were trying to do – you were just doing it. You were not even explaining properly what you were trying to do.

Then when people wanted a personal response, a little bit of care, a little bit of personal attention, it was not forthcoming. Why was it not forthcoming? Who was responsible for not enabling that to take place to show the caring side that we all in here have at heart? Why were people let down on this particular occasion?

In the past Councillor Harris led by example. When he admitted something went wrong he said, “I have got it wrong and I am going to fix it.” Why can you not follow his lead? He was man enough to be able to do it; why can you not do something similar?

Then in terms of Scrutiny if we really do believe that Scrutiny has a role to play in this Council, why ask them to do something? Why when they come up with a perfectly sensible way forward do you slam it back in the face of the cross-party people who put a lot of effort into the original hearing and the call in and that was the way they were treated. They were treated with contempt and also all the people in the audience that were there to listen to it. It does do nothing for this Council when we see the way that Scrutiny was dealt with on this occasion. It is for that reason I support the reference back. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dan Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. There is a Talmudic saying that if four people tell you that you are drunk, even if you feel sober, you are most probably drunk. (*laughter*) We can re-word that today for our Labour Executive. If four groups tell you that you are wrong, you are in almost probability wrong.

Families and those most affected by this decision are telling you that your decision on this matter is wrong. Some of your own Members are telling you that on this matter you are wrong. The Opposition groups are telling you on this matter you are wrong. The Scrutiny Board, having considered this matter in the most tremendous detail for seven hours (that is unheard of, that is even longer than Councillor Procter’s Scrutiny Boards) (*laughter*) they told you the same thing. You are wrong on this matter.

The arrogance in so quickly reaffirming this poor decision that will have a staggering effect on vulnerable residents is itself staggering. It reflects so badly on this Executive, it reflects so badly on us as a Council and a city, I hope today we will seize the opportunity to correct it.

It is very rare that I quote Councillor Lay but he is absolutely correct when he says when we are wrong we should admit it. It is equally staggering that a group who denigrate at every possible opportunity any proposal whatsoever to move towards involving the private sector in any kind of health care would even make such a proposal.

I hope we are going to seize this unique opportunity today. I hope Members opposite will show some real backbone that they will not allow themselves to be bullied into falling behind what is a poor decision. Hmm - overbearing leaders bullying their supporters into toeing the line. Clearly it is not just a Trump tactic. *(laughter)*

I support this reference back today, Lord Mayor, and for the good of our city and our residents, particularly our vulnerable residents, I hope we all will. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dawn Collins – I thought she had withdraw, she has not, so Dawn Collins.

COUNCILLOR COLLINS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. At the recent call in serious concerns were raised by the families of those still living in our care homes. The families pleaded with the elected Members to reconsider plans to close the institutions that their family members thought of as home. Many were concerned about the poor level of public sector care being offered as alternatives to the good care Leeds City Council currently provides.

As a result of the call in Scrutiny identified a list of recommendations it would forward to Executive Board for consideration. One of the recommendations was that the Director of Adult Social Services provides extra focus on working to ensure that the quality of alternative care in the independent sector is improved considerably.

The closure of the majority of our remaining homes is not going to happen this year, so it would seem a sensible request and something that the Executive Board could endorse.

However, the residents of Manorfield House in Horsforth have now been given their six weeks' notice and their families have been told that they have until the middle of December to find a new home and leave, even though the Director of Adult Social Services has given me assurance that residents will only be moved when the families are comfortable with the quality of care in the new home. This is not the information that is being passed down to residents' families, however.

The approach by the Adult Social Services team to the employees at the home is very compassionate and employees have had multiple meetings where they have discussed what alternatives are available to them for their future. They have been supported through the process of closing Manorfield House. The residents and their families have had no such support. They have been given a deadline for leaving and the residents' families have been told that it will be up to them to choose where their loved one goes next. They have been told that there is a shortage of social workers to support them and officers have admitted to residents' families that they do not know the alternative public sector homes and have yet to visit many of them.

I have asked for a meeting with the Director of Adult Social Services to again discuss how things might be done in a more sympathetic way but she is currently on vacation for several weeks. I have been told that a meeting with her second cannot take place for a further ten days yet.

I challenge the comment on page 80 that the Assessment and Transfer Team have the ability to help support the families during a transition process and I request that the Councillors who do have influence in that area address this issue urgently. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. We have now got Councillor Matthew Robinson speaking on behalf of Caroline Anderson and then Councillor Lamb has indicated he would like to speak straight after.

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Firstly may I start by applauding the campaigners, the Councillors and the residents who kept this issue on the agenda and kept this very high profile. There is no doubt it is an emotive matter. I think we all know that we want to have respect for those who have served our communities in their later years, we know that we want this for our own family, for our own friends, for ourselves but as a city we should have this as a priority for all residents.

I have to applaud some of the Members opposite as well who I am sure there were stages where arms were being twisted and they stuck to principles on this and they stuck to what they thought was right. I continue to applaud all Members for doing that where they put their principles above policy.

We have heard the word “wrong” mentioned and admitting people are wrong. I think that is the first step. It is actually admitting that there is a plan for the future, that there will be a full review that will not be rushed through, that will actually take into consideration the representations made by so many people. There is a real risk that if we do not pause, that this is railroaded through, that it will lose the trust of so many people in the city and it will lose the trust of so many people in this room as well.

Councillor Anderson mentioned the role of Scrutiny. For six years now as a Bank Bench Councillor Scrutiny has been one of the prime ways to bring issues forward that the administration might not want to discuss, that might require more time to look into. The Scrutiny Board has obviously spent a huge amount of time looking into this and that we risk just ignoring what Scrutiny Board says actually is a failing of trust in our system and a trust of what goes on here. I know heads are being shaken here and you will get your chance to have your say but I think that that is a feeling that is coming through from so many people.

What we do not want is, we do not want so many older people in our city left in isolation, left away from their families, left away from their friends, feeling ignored in their later years as they make representations on this issue and as they try to have some enjoyment in their later years. I support the reference back, Lord Mayor, and look forward to the answer. Thank you. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. We will go to Councillor Latty; Councillor Lamb has indicated he would like to speak slightly later. Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR P LATTY: I have worries about the proposals to close these care homes. We want to encourage people to live independently in their own homes for as long as they can. This is better for their quality of life and it saves the Council money on residential care. It is a policy that this Council has pursued for a number of years and one that we support, but not everyone can stay safely in their own homes and they need good residential care.

Our residential care homes become less and less popular, the number of existing residents decreases and the homes themselves become less viable, so there are circumstances where we support the closure of care homes where the process is managed responsibly. However, it is important that each case is judged on its own individual merits and that a number of safeguards are in place to protect the residents of these care homes. If those safeguards are not in place then a home should not be closed. There should be equal or better alternative provision in the independent sector so that those wishing to remain in care homes have somewhere to go. This should not simply be a random location at the other side of the city but in an appropriate location where the resident has support and links with the community and their family.

There should also be consideration of how friendship groups in the existing homes can be maintained and strengthened in any new arrangements. Finally, there should be proactive and comprehensive communication with the residents at each stage of the process; keeping them engaged in the decisions that affect them is of the utmost importance. I worry too about whether these factors have been properly taken into account in respect of the Green, Siegen Manor, Middlecross and Manorfield. The quality of care in the independent sector is not as consistent as we would wish it to be. The communication with residents seems to have been patchy and left a number of them confused and anxious, the issue of maintaining friendship groups unresolved.

With a significant proportion of the Members in this Chamber having grave concern, I think we have to ask if this Council really wants to go through with these proposals. It is right that we ask Executive Board to reconsider its decision. Thank you. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ryan Stephenson.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think this shines a long overdue spotlight on the political decisions made here at Leeds City Council and they are indeed laid bare for all to see. We often hear that talk is cheap and it is actions that we look forward to seeing in practice, and no matter how poetic talk is – and I praise Councillor Gruen for his analogies earlier – we do want to see some action.

Those of us unlucky enough to have heard Councillor James Lewis on Radio Leeds a few weeks ago heard that this decision was not one about finance at all, so you wonder what is the driving factor behind it. When you look at the politics of the situation I am not one who often likes to quote the Shadow Lord Chancellor too much but when you do need a Socialist rent a quote he is always a good one to look towards. When you have got a situation where the Members of Parliament in the city are telling the Labour administration they are wrong on these issues, they must look at

the situation properly and go back and look again with the political pressure that is mounting behind this.

The other thing that concerns me is a comment earlier by the Exec Member who commented about the rising demand for domiciliary care over care homes and I am not sure what experience other Members in this Chamber have regarding dementia and care homes but from a personal perspective, domiciliary care is good and it has its place but there comes a point when elderly people need something more than just being in their own home with visits a few times a day and that is where care homes come into place. Shutting down care homes, especially those that deal with dementia, is quite a bitter pill to swallow for residents who have loved ones in those homes.

It also flies in the face a little of the dementia friendly city that we all want to achieve for Leeds and in the face as well of the fact that we had a G8 Summit here in the UK on this very issue back in 2014.

We need to have a co-ordinated approach to how we deal with all those issues and we need to have a better regard for that strategy when we are talking about care home provision in Leeds and in the city. I will also add my notes of praise and thanks for the action group, particularly Lindsey Cannon who has been a stalwart on campaigning of issue of dementia care across the city for a number of years and in that respect I would urge the administration to reconsider on this sombre matter and go back and look again. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Comment by Councillor Amanda Carter has been withdrawn. Councillor James Lewis has indicated he would like to speak.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Later.

THE LORD MAYOR: OK, Councillor Paul Wadsworth.

COUNCILLOR WADSWORTH: Thank you, Lord Mayor. We have heard some great speeches from both sides but not as many from that side – not as many speeches, full stop, from that side as from this side and that does surprise me, but the Better Lives Strategy, to me that means a better life for the person there and a better plan. I do not think that this plan that is coming forward now is going to be better for the older person or is a plan. We just need to look at that.

We have heard many figures particularly about room sizes, about en suites, about getting wheelchairs in and the thing is, our care homes are rated good and we can do what we want with figures, we can massage figures, we can change figures etc.

The original decision was probably a difficult decision to make at Executive Board in the first place but was probably driven heavily by the financial aspects of it and we all accept on this side that the finances do play a big part, but it was then called in and it was called in effectively (or attempted to be called in) by all sides. There were a number of Members on all sides, the ruling administration did not manage to call it in and some of them were courageous in trying to. I do not think they just put their name on a paper; I expect discussions were had about whether it should be called in or it should go ahead both before and after Exec Board. I expect there were many decisions about that.

As I say, money is an issue but compassion for older people, and I think you have lost your compassion, particularly on this Front Bench and particular the Exec Board have lost their compassion for older people and you need to try and bring that back. I think when everybody is telling you you are wrong, Councillor Cohen makes the point that everybody is telling you you are wrong, you need to sit back and think about it.

Scrutiny called it in and immediately you rushed back with, effectively, we are not going to bother about what Scrutiny said after seven hours, we are going to carry on with relatively the same decision, very little change. It does surprise me that you are not looking at the quality of care for people, the best for the residents and placing them in appropriate care but also with their friendship groups and that is why I am supporting the call in. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Peter Harrand.

COUNCILLOR HARRAND: Thank you, Lord Mayor. About a fortnight ago I was attacked by a lady in a supermarket. *(laughter)* She came up to me and, I will not tell the words but she was quite colourful on why I was closing these homes. It took a few minutes to calm her down and I said to her, "It is not me, it is the Labour Party" and she almost laughed, she said, "No, you cannot get away with that. The Labour Party would not do this to us." I said it was, it is the Labour Party that is doing this and she went quiet and she shook her head and walked away muttering and I wonder if that is one more that you might just possibly have lost then. *(interruption)* It is the Labour Party that is doing this.

I am now going to be helpful. If you go through the long Minute that came after this discussion, sub-paragraph (m) refers to Bay Tree Resource Centre which is in my ward. The last time I asked, which I admit was a few months ago, it is half empty. Bay Tree and Yew Tree next to it are run by the Methodist Housing Association. I do not think we see them as Rachmanesque landlords trying to screw the most they can out of the tenants. Will Councillor Charlwood tell me when she winds up, is she sure there is no spare capacity in the Bay Tree Dementia Centre and if there is why are we not using it? I may be wrong but the last time I asked it was less than half full. Over to you. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Comment by Councillor Wood withdrawn.
Councillor Caroline Anderson.

COUNCILLOR C ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would echo what my colleagues have said, particularly Councillor Pat Latty, in respect of quality of life for residents in care homes who do not want to be moved and they do not want to be shuffled around, nor do their families want to be moving around the city to try and visit them in different places.

I know from personal experience how difficult it is to get somebody settled in a care home and how long it takes them to get used to it, never mind moving them again somewhere else. We need to ensure that there is adequate and just as good provision for them elsewhere in the city. Please review this decision. Thank you. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Gerald Wilkinson.

COUNCILLOR WILKINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Three years ago the Executive Board chose to close Primrose Hill Nursing Home in Boston Spa due to the lack of demand. This building is being offered for sale now with preference given to a nursing home provider due to demand. This showed three years ago a distinct lack of joined up thinking so they should reflect on this decision as they consider closing these three nursing homes.

I realise that these three are destined to close due to financial issues rather than demand, but as people are getting older the demand is increasing, therefore funding must be found at the expense of other less important expenditure. In the 20th Century the average age was three score years and ten; it is now closer to four score years and ten with increasing immobility, therefore nursing homes are needed now and more so in the future. I support this call back. Thank you. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor James Lewis.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am grateful to Councillor Stephenson, one of my many adoring fans who I know listens to my many regular appearances on Radio Leeds. I am absolutely delighted for Ryan to give me an opportunity just to talk about exactly how much resource this administration is putting into Adult Social Care, because to listen to the speeches from over there I do not want anybody to be leaving here with the wrong impression about actually this administration's commitment not only to funding Adult Social Care, and we will be looking at Adult Social Care increasing the amount of cash we spend on it year on year, but also as a share of the Council's budget. I think that is something important to reflect.

I think it is also important to reflect as well our commitment to providing modern facilities which is at the heart of the Better Lives Strategy and our commitment, which has been in place since September 2014, so maybe some newly elected Members might not be aware of this, Ryan, but we have got a commitment in place to put over £30m of the Council's capital budget into modern health and Adult Social Care facilities to support the city. I think it is important this point is made in discussions on the reference back to really bring home our commitment to bring change and improvement, even at a time when we are having massive budget cuts and making difficult decisions all over the Council, our commitment is there to put the resource in for the facilities that are needed.

I am glad you have given me the opportunity to raise that because I think it is important for people to understand. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Alan Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. No-one is suggesting that the administration abandons the Better Life Strategy. What we are saying is that by its very necessity the Better Life Strategy needs flexibility; flexibility in terms of timing and flexibility in terms of finance. It is our responsibility if we are going to close these care homes to find somewhere for people to go and it will be irresponsible to close them when there is not adequate care somewhere else for them to go to.

For that reason all parties, Members of all parties have told you you have got this wrong and need to take some time to pause. The residents of these care homes have told you that you have got it wrong and you need to take some time. Their carers and families are telling you you have got it wrong. The staff that work in them are telling you you have got it wrong. The trade unions that represent those staff are telling you you have got it wrong. The Labour Member of Parliament for Leeds East is telling you you have got it wrong and there are even Members of your own group who are telling you that you have got it wrong. What gives you the right to tell all of those people that you are right and they are wrong? That is not acceptable.

Lord Mayor, how are people supposed to retain their faith in consultation when at every turn when Scrutiny has looked at this in such detail, when the Executive Board has looked at it, when the responses to consultations have told you what you should do, that you then ignore all of those people? I have to tell Members of Council that despite everything that has been said and all the warm words they are just that – warm words – because this administration has already begun the process of closing these care homes. I hope the Executive Member will tell us she is going to stop it immediately, tell us that she did not know anything about it and tell us she is going to reverse that, because I can tell you in The Green they have already instructed the staff to stop taking anybody else. They have taken the admissions board from the office down and hidden it away in a cupboard so nobody can see the situation. That is a disgrace, Lord Mayor. They have got it wrong. It will take a lot more strength and there would be a lot more respect from every Member in this Council and all of the people of Leeds watching if they just stand up and say do you know what, let us take this back to the Executive Board, let us have another think about this and let us try and make sure we do right by the people of Leeds.

That is a really simple thing to do and that is all we are asking. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: The next point has been withdrawn. Councillor Charlwood to sum up.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Just to be clear, I have three minutes, Lord Mayor, not six?

THE LORD MAYOR: Yes.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: It is a bit confusing with reference backs and numbers and thing like that. Thanks very, very much to everyone who has contributed in such a long debate that has so much interest from across the Chamber and across the community and across Leeds. I would like to thank family Members and people who have used the services for all their contributions to Scrutiny Board, to consultations. This is a very emotive and difficult decision and process for anyone to go through, for me and for all of us and I think that has been reflected in the debate we have had.

I would just say I think the Tories need to do their homework a little bit. They have got so many things wrong in all of their comments and they have missed the point entirely. We have actually accepted the Scrutiny Board's recommendations in full and that was mentioned a number of times by different speakers. They have simply got that completely wrong.

What else have they got wrong? The other thing that was very worrying to hear was about the Director of Adult Social Services who was actually having had an operation, so I would like Councillor Collins to retract that comment.

Just back to the substantive issues, we are now in Phase 3 of a five year programme. It is very difficult, as I have said. I was at the ADASS National Conference the other day and it was widely accepted by all of the Directors and senior officers in social care and all Lead Members, frankly, from all parties, that that traditional model of care that we are talking about is outdated and needs to be replaced, preferably with extra care and this is what we are trying to do.

What we need in Leeds is more nursing care which we cannot provide, Councillor Harrand and Councillor Wilkinson. We cannot provide that as a Council because we are not registered to, but we are trying to modernise our services for the future and that includes extra care.

The quality of care in our care homes is very difficult, in the traditional care homes it is very difficult to maintain as numbers dwindle and I think that point has been made. I think using this as a political football in the way that it has been is a real shame for all the people who are involved and the families around the city. The idea that this does not affect all of us deeply as well because we are in Government here, we have to make these very difficult decisions. I think it is also hypocritical to say that we have made these decisions out of choice. We have had to find £8m this year in savings from the Adult Social Care budget. This closure programme saves £2.7m. Next year we have to find £10m and this is because we are not getting funding from Theresa May. You are saying we are wrong; we say you are wrong, we say Cameron is wrong (*applause*) and Theresa May is wrong and they need to make a change in the funding that we get so that we can provide these services for people.

David Mowatt the MP, the Under Secretary of State for Care and Support even said there is a crisis in funding for social care at the ADASS Conference and he said he was going to lobby Government internally and be an advocate for the sector. I think you should do the same and go back to your Government and tell them that they have got this wrong as well. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Time, Rebecca.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: I will finish there. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: I call for a vote.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: A recorded vote please, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Why did I wonder if that was going to happen!

*(A recorded vote was taken on the Reference Back in the name of
Councillor Golton)*

THE LORD MAYOR: The vote was those present 94; all those in favour 34; all those against 60. LOST

I call for the vote on the second amendment in the name of Councillor Buckley. Recorded vote.

(A recorded vote was taken on the Reference Back in the name of Councillor Buckley.)

THE LORD MAYOR: There are 93 present; all those in favour 34; against 59. LOST

Councillor Salma Arif.

COUNCILLOR ARIF: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, I speak on Minute 92 page 104. When one hears the words “health inequality” to my mind that means unfair and avoidable differences in people’s health, namely those coming from lower socio-economic backgrounds. The importance of addressing health inequality should be a priority for us all, certainly when you look at the worrying statistics in some of the most deprived areas in Leeds, one such ward being Gipton and Harehills which I represent. Harehills is currently the most diversely populated area with Gipton also changing in terms of ethnic make-up. This and the transient nature of the population notably in Harehills is a real challenge in terms of evidencing changes in the health status.

Health inequalities continue to exist for black and minority ethnic communities with gypsy, traveller and Roma communities experiencing some of the poorest health. Life expectancy in the ward is 77 years comparing this to Leeds as a whole, which is 81 years, and not surprisingly the same data shows that a male living in areas such as Bramham or Boston Spa has a life expectancy of 88 years.

In his annual report Dr Cameron sets out the role of public health over the last 150 years and it is clear there have been many positive developments. The past saw one in five babies dying before reaching the age of one; today in Leeds we have the lowest infant mortality rate, a sign of the potential of prevention work in addressing some of the great health challenges we face both locally and nationally.

However, while the potential for public health at a local level is clear to see, sadly we have little evidence that the current Government sees this vital work in the same way. Key public health services have been subject to cut after cut. These cuts have implications and in Leeds it will mean we effectively have £24m less to spend on public health priorities in the city. Thankfully the people I represent in my ward cannot afford to be neglected by this Government.

Areas such as Gipton and Harehills face many challenges in which the drive to improve health outcomes are fundamental to stimulating both opportunities and a better quality of life for all. I am pleased to say that through the priorities of this administration the vision set out in the new Health and Wellbeing Strategy we as a city are working to tackle poverty and, to quote from the strategy directly, to also have a relentless focus on reducing health inequalities in Leeds.

Further to this we also have set the bold ambition to be the best for health and wellbeing and I am incredibly encouraged by the fact we have connected this ambition to a vision which recognises those in the most deprived area in the city that

Leeds will be a healthy and caring city for all ages where people who are the poorest improve their health the fastest. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Rebecca Charlwood to sum up.

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: I will not take my full six minutes but I would just like to welcome the comments made by Councillor Arif and her passion for her ward comes across very much. She is right to raise the health of the population in her ward and the relentless focus we are having as a Council in addressing health inequalities, so it is exactly this that is driving our Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the Healthy Lifestyles Programme is an example of that, that we are looking to help people with a wide variety of lifestyle issues that are going to help both children and families that are going to help them to raise their life expectancy hopefully in a large way in wards which are more deprived.

She rightly raises the cuts we are experiencing in public health as well. The 10% cut for public health over a two year period which is absolutely enormous really, so again we would like to push back on Government for that and see if in the Autumn Statement we can have a bit more back for public health. Thank you. (*applause*)

(ii) Resources & Strategy

THE LORD MAYOR: Resources and Strategy, Graham Hyde.

COUNCILLOR HYDE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, I welcome the opportunity to speak on Minute 69 page 88 and Minute 89 page 102.

Both sides of the Chamber will be well aware of the ongoing challenges that this organisation faces and the last debate we have had just exacerbates some of those difficult decisions that this Authority has to make.

This side of the Chamber has questioned many of the Government policies recently and will be doing so in the future. For the past few months it has become ever more evident just how detached our Government is from people in the UK. It has been shown once again that George Osborne's living wage is an issue. If you assess George Osborne's reign as Chancellor of the Exchequer you will find a number of false economies. We also find a number of half measures and cuts but we all are well aware that the ex-Chancellor enjoys wielding his axe, as we are all aware in this Council over a number of years. One false economy and one we surely cannot ignore is the illusion Mr Osborne has created with the rebranding of the national minimum wage as the national living wage, which was nothing short of a political gimmick, in my view.

Let us be clear, the national minimum wage is a rate set in line with how affordable it is for businesses to pay their staff a particularly hourly rate. The key to the living wage, and a proper living wage I might stress, is that it is usually tied to people's actual cost of living, i.e. what they need in order to live each month, as we are all aware.

If we need any more evidence of how disregarded Mr Osborne is with the British public, his disingenuous policy and his pitiful rate of pay is now the icing on the cake. In April this year Mr Osborne's living wage was £7.20 for the employees

aged 25 and over, with the national minimum wage sitting at £6.70. Not only is Osborne's living wage ravaged by social injustice, his calculation for what it takes to get falls far short.

The Living Wage Foundation has been working incredibly hard to engage with employers and have them to commit to paying the real living wage of £8.25, over a pound more than Mr Osborne's miscalculation. Lord Mayor, Mr Osborne's misguided, uninformed calculations do not even end there. Our ex-Chancellor predicts that the national living wage will rise to £9.35 by 2020, only for the Office of Budget Responsibility to say that in future increases will be pegged at £9.

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR HYDE: Sorry, Lord Mayor, can I just finish in the last paragraph?

THE LORD MAYOR: Quickly.

COUNCILLOR HYDE: I am delighted that Leeds City Council is actually paying its staff £8.25 per hour and I am confident that many of the other businesses in this city will be following the same suit and congratulations to this administration for putting in the right rate of pay. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Hayden.

COUNCILLOR HAYDEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am commenting on page 88 , Minute 69 and in particular I want to focus on the importance of investing to save.

This is something we have been focusing on for some time within Children's Services and there are numerous examples of how we are investing early to produce longer term savings for society as a whole. One of our biggest successes, and I am really pleased to be able to speak on this, is the Staying Put Programme which ensures young people who are in care stay with their foster family for longer, resulting in huge benefits for that young person including improved education outcomes and better employment opportunities.

We are the most successful Authority in the country with regard to this initiative, which is great, but it comes at a cost. The Staying Put Programme costs just over £1.3m but we receive £220,000 in Government grant, meaning that we have to find the extra £1m from elsewhere. We have also continued to invest in Early Intervention Programmes in order to safely reduce the number of looked after children. We know that better outcomes can be achieved by intervening early in the life of a problem, investing early where it will make the most difference both in terms of financial savings and for the children and young people themselves. We have seen huge successes and the number of looked after children is reducing but in order for that reduction to continue we need to progress with our strategy of early intervention, investing where it will make the most difference both in terms of financial savings but also better outcomes for our children and young people.

There is mounting evidence that our approach is working. Since 2011 we have safely reduced the number of children looked after by over 14%. This compares

to a national increase of over 6%. This has saved the city approximately £15m between April 2012 and November 2015.

We have all seen and heard the evidence that early intervention is a strategy that works and really does improve outcomes for vulnerable groups. We know that programmes such as Family First produces results and we have received national recognition for our programme. Therefore, it deeply saddens me that a report released by the Children's Society shows that Government funding for early intervention services in Leeds has fallen by 60% by 2010 and is expected to have fallen by 72% by 2020.

If we do not receive adequate funding from Government for intervention programmes that have been proven to work and that deliver long term savings, we will all be paying the price later down the line. Cutting funding for early intervention services is short-sighted and given the current favour of throwing out the policies of the previous Government, I have not yet lost all hope - although that is difficult today, I have to say – that it might be reversed. I sincerely hope that Theresa May has the foresight that her predecessor lacked. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Neil Dawson.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I can almost pick up where Councillor left off and talking about Theresa May because when she first became Prime Minister she said her priorities were looking after those people who were just making do, those people who are just surviving in society. Let us see if her Government actually follows those actions because the previous Government for the last six years which she was a member of did not.

Let us look. We have made £330m of savings in Local Government and we are required to make a further £76m in this Authority. What has the impact of this been? It has been one of inequalities across our city. They have persisted. A fifth of the Leeds population, almost 155,000 people, are classified as being in absolute poverty. Approximately 25,000 people in Leeds have needed assistance with food banks between March 2015 and April 2016. Over 28,000 Leeds children are in poverty, 64% - that is two-thirds – are estimated to be from working families.

This Government needs to change its priorities. Over the last six years what have we seen? We have seen a Government that has missed its financial targets, a Government that has reduced Corporation Tax by around 10%, it has reduced Capital Gains Tax, it has reduced Inheritance Tax and it has reduced the top rate of tax. That money has not gone to those people who are just making do. It has gone into the hands of some of the wealthiest people in this society. It has not been the priority of this Government, they need to change course, Philip Hammond needs to change course in the Budget and do what George Osborne never did. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stewart Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor, that was a nice surprise, I thought we had got to time.

Yes, Invest to Save. I was just thinking earlier about Councillor Charlwood's response to the debate that we had earlier and it was all about going to conference and

everybody else there had exactly the same pressures and it was all down to the Government not giving us enough money. Well, she is right, it is ultimately down to the Government and the way that it redistributes the resources that it has and the priorities that it has and Local Government has not been the priority for them.

I am also interested in Councillor Hayden and her comments on this part of the agenda because she was talking about how sometimes you need to innovate and even though it costs your money now and it might cost you more money on a budget line now, you know that in the future you will reap the benefits of it and so the Staying Put Campaign is something where the Council has put in its own money because it says, do you know what, we know that these people's future life chances depend on us adding that little bit extra support.

We need to express that across the Council and we have got some great examples. We mentioned before about the Neighbourhood Networks. That is something that this Council innovated, developed and turned into something that was really useful. It is not something that we have to do; it is something that we decided we should be doing. We need to do a little bit more of that Invest to Save, even if it does not initially save us something, even if it does not initially take something off that balance sheet. We know it is something that is worthwhile doing because we know that we need to safeguard for the future. This is one of the reasons why the Labour Group should not be too defensive about this argument about Adult Social Care because what we are trying to point out is, where you thought you were going to be right now, you cannot get there and so we need to make sure that we are actually enabling the different provision that can be provided, and sometimes the Council can spend a little bit too long saying "No, no, no, you have got it wrong, we like to do it this way, do not try and suggest to do it another way."

We found out the hard way in Rothwell when Dolphin Manor, which was the community trying to do what they needed to do to create the best care for their area, were undermined, actually, by our own officers when actually it was an opportunity that should have been grasped and it is something that could have been copied throughout this city and we would be in a better place now if we had actually done that encouragement to begin with.

We need to think about that in terms of the social care debate we have got at the moment and instead of thinking about can we give £4m to a partner over here that has been our partner and our friend for a long while, maybe we should be creating new partners that actually will deliver more benefits to help the wellbeing of our citizens. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. That is the end of comments on the Minutes. Councillor Blake to sum up.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I think the last contributions that we have just had from Councillors Hyde, Hayden, Neil Dawson and Councillor Golton actually have been really helpful in helping us to set the context for the really difficult debate and discussion that we have had earlier.

Let us be very proud as an administration in incredibly difficult circumstances that we have lifted the pay of the lowest paid in our Authority and they will be getting paid £8.25 an hour from January. *(applause)*

The theme that is running through this whole debate that we have had today is a complete and utter lack of comprehension and understanding from people particularly just to the left of me on the impact of Government policies that are taking such a toll on the people in our city. When you look at the statistics of children in poverty and you know that 60% of them have at least one adult in work, the scandal of in-work poverty in this country is a disgrace and it is only going to get worse because of the benefit cuts that are coming in this week. You know, there are going to be people in the city who will no longer be able to afford their rent any more after these interventions and as a Council we should be debating the impact of those policies in this Chamber.

I agree with Councillor Golton following on from Councillor Hayden's point. We need to have the space to innovate and in the Children's Services Early Intervention £1 invested in family group conferences realises £4 of savings from further problems that have been averted that can be then paid back. Let us keep fighting this Government to make sure that we get powers devolved down to us that we so dearly need. We have proved time and time again that when we are given the wherewithal we can do it.

Going back to the first part of the meeting this afternoon, look at exactly this case. Councillor Latty, I do not know what world you are living in. You are being surprised that there are health inequalities in this city. I am sorry but this is exactly what we have been pointing out. I know you sat on the Health and Wellbeing Board for some time. This is exactly the point that we are making and the cuts that we have heard today, further cuts that are coming through to public health are deeply worrying and will make those inequalities worse.

I just want to really reflect on the debate that we have had around Adult Social Care. I just have such frustration with the Tories in this Council. As Councillor Charlwood said, she went to the Adult Social Care Conference and the Tory Leaders of Councils are holding their heads in horror about the cuts that they are facing.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: You just said it is not about the money.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Look at what Mel Few is saying and the fact that the 2% precept being raised in Surrey, do not let us forget that Surrey got £24m in transitional funding last year when Leeds got nothing. (*applause*) He is saying that the 2% precept is only going to raise half the money that they need in Surrey. We know, we have talked in here before, it is the revenue side of how we provide the care and as Councillor Lewis has pointed out, where we can put the capital in we are looking to work and increase our partnerships working with the Health Service to develop the care packages we need.

As Councillor Charlwood has been at pains to point out, first of all Executive Board, as Councillor Carter and Councillor Golton know, accepted the recommendations that came through from the last Scrutiny Board. Let us get that absolutely straight. If we need to look at the Minute then we will, that is quite right, you have said that, we will look at it in Executive Board but that is absolutely what happened.

You know, the idea that these changes have just come in from nowhere, these changes are the result of a six year strategy up to now that will be going forward over many years to come and there has been time for reflection, there has been massive consultation with people on the ground, with ourselves, through Scrutiny or cross party working that we do in this Council.

I think there is one element that we have actually been missing out on. The idea with The Green is to move it into an intermediate care facility. That is a step up or a step down facility for people to keep them out of hospital and what we know is that if people are admitted inappropriately into hospital the chances are, I am afraid, that very many of them will not come out again. Let us be clear. *(applause)*

COUNCILLOR: Most older people come out of hospital.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: The upward trend in hospital deaths of the frail, elderly nationally in Leeds is going to show that fewer than one in ten people will die at home by 2030. This is what the Better Life Strategy is all about. It is about transforming independent supportive care in people's own homes and when they cannot live in their own homes having the proper up-to-date extra care facilities with support, with nursing packages to see them through.

These are incredibly tough times that we are living through. Let us be under no illusion how difficult it is and to suggest that all of us do not care about the difficult circumstances facing people in this city is shameful, absolutely shameful. I can guarantee that we will do everything we can to make sure that people continue to get the support, to move them if that is appropriate and to make sure that, as has been guaranteed, the provision they go to will be at least as good if not better going forward.

This is our opportunity. The Chancellor will be standing on his feet in the House of Commons on November 23rd. Shouldn't we as a Council be getting together to lobby for more funds to go into Adult Social Care? Councillor Gruen is right for the first time ever this issue – sorry, I did not mean that! *(laughter)* Strike that out of the minutes! Seriously, for the first time ever Adult Social Care is on the front page of every newspaper, on the news programmes, it is a national crisis, a national scandal that has been caused by the austerity measures of Governments going back to 2020. *(applause)*

I want to quote the Tory Lead from the Local Government Association around Adult Social Care. She is asking for a fair care system which keeps people out of hospital living independent, dignified lives at home and in the community. Shouldn't we all be signing up to that and looking at our provision to make sure we can deliver it in the best way we possibly can? Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: We will have the vote to receive the Minutes. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED. We will see you back here at quarter-to.

(Short break)

ITEM 12 – REPORT ON DEVOLVED MATTERS

THE LORD MAYOR: We will go straight on to Devolved Matters.
Councillor Blake.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Can I move that the report be received as in the Notice. Thank you, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Wakefield.

COUNCILLOR WAKEFIELD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I always get this favourite spot! Can I talk about the Bus Bill and, indeed, the potential for all of us to unite this afternoon because it is 30 years ago this year since the buses were deregulated in this city and I think there is no-one in this Chamber who would not agree that we have had 30 years of misery and demoralisation for bus passengers. They are absolutely sick and fed up of having unreliable buses, infrequent buses, sudden cancellations and actually expensive journeys. If you compare that to London in terms of them never being affected by deregulation you can understand why our patronage has halved in those 30 years and London has doubled to two billion.

I do think sometimes, and I made a reference here to Greg Mulholland, that people under-estimate the potential of buses in our city, the role they play in terms of getting people to jobs, in terms of getting people to training, ending social isolation and actually improving the environment because, as Richard will tell on our Park and Ride, every bus that is full takes 75 cars off the road so they do play a vital role.

We have a Bus Bill, our biggest opportunity for 30 years to end this chaos, end this misery for bus passengers but there is one flaw in it, a major flaw and that is under the guise of Clause 21 which prevents Local Authorities running buses - any further Local Authorities owning and running buses and I think the House of Lords (again, that radical bunch of people) have already said it, to prevent Local Authorities doing it is ideological dogma and that was said. In fact, the House of Lords has voted to remove Clause 21 and it is back in the Commons. The evidence is overwhelming. Look at the Lothian Authority, gold medals, £1.60 a journey, growing patronage up to 55%; Nottingham, growing patronage again, fastest growing outside of London; Reading, all winning gold medals for being the bus company of the year or environmental company of the year running buses and I do think in all fairness Local Authorities should be given an opportunity to run buses if they so desire.

I would say this, Transport Committee – because I get the progressive Tories on the Transport Committee and the Liberals – voted unanimously to actually write to the MPs to plead with them to actually remove Clause 21 and give Local Authorities a fair chance to play a role in their transport, in their economy for their people. I move, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Tom Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: My Lord Mayor, I thought that if I could not get flooding in under Executive Board I could get it in under Devolution! *(laughter)*

Firstly, to paragraph 3.4, the vote to leave the European Union and the advance of Faragists everywhere. God help us now that America has voted for Donald Trump. Civilisation is only a thin veneer even in advanced western countries and dark and deeply irrational forces lurk beneath. Mr Farage sounds and dresses like

an old-fashioned on-course bookmaker – all he needs is a trilby and a big leather satchel. Honest Nigel, 27 years at Kempton, never welshed on a bet. On the other hand, anyone who bets with him for any length of time will come out losing in the end! *(laughter)*

Then to paragraph 3.6 which is to do with flooding, to which there are two parts. The immediate response to the Boxing Day events has been very good, with normality restored as quickly as reasonably possible. The second part, designing and building long term flood defences, is less certain. One Sunday afternoon just over a fortnight ago when I was cutting a hawthorn hedge I was rung by a lady from the Yorkshire Evening Post who wanted a quote about flooding, at least in part because I had been Chairman of the Flooding Scrutiny Inquiry which we had about ten years ago and perhaps because she could not get anybody else on a Sunday afternoon.

She thought it was easier to get money for flood defences in the south than it was in Yorkshire. I said that was probably because until the end of last year the most recent severe flooding had been in the Somerset Levels and the Thames Valley. Also Environment Agency cost benefit analyses may further the south-east. If there was a scheme to save 50 back-to-back houses in Leeds valued at £80,000 each it would not come out as well from a cost benefit formula as a scheme to save 50 riverside mansions at Staines or Barnes valued at £1m each. Also, commercial premises do not seem to get as high a priority as houses, which would not be helpful in a flood plain at Kirkstall.

An article appeared next day in the Yorkshire Evening Post which came out reasonably well, though they do not always, and it was useful in keeping flood relief in the public eye. The fear must be that two or three dry years will see slippage and downgrading of projects or pausing, as it is called nowadays, leaving everyone at risk when the next inundations come. National Government must learn that flood defences must be made while the sun shines. Nothing beyond emergency rescue can be done once the waters have risen.

We must have speedy commitment from those in Whitehall and Westminster and this is really a regional rather than a local thing, there is not much Leeds City Council could do in isolation. I agree with the comments that Councillor Wakefield made about bus services as well. Thank you, my Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrew Carter.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Yes, thank you, Lord Mayor. Just on Councillor Wakefield's comments, I have to say I do tend to agree with him and I am not hung up at all about Clause 21. However, I would just point out that the old Transport Committee of Metro was taking a very strong line with the bus companies in terms of bus franchising and Quality Contracts. That, under the Combined Authority, has gone suspiciously quiet and I get quoted back to me sometimes, well, it is the Tyne and Wear case and the fact that Tyne and Wear lost out when they tried to introduce Quality Contracts.

I am really concerned that we are not keeping the heat on the operators as we ought to in Leeds and in particular First Bus. First Bus, who have always never been backwards in coming forwards when it was a question of objecting to anything this city wanted to do in terms of a 21st Century public transport system, so I do not have a

lot of sympathy for First Bus. They also have a very profitable set of routes in this city and there are all sorts of things I think we could have done and still can be doing to make them more responsive to the customers. Councillor Jarosz recently had a meeting in Pudsey with her constituents, my colleagues and I had a meeting in our ward with our constituents and we had quite a lot of people there. First Bus were represented and I do not know how you get the message over to these people. It was very blunt and to the point but nothing much happens and I do think that the current Transport Committee needs to step further up to the mark. We need to know where we are going on Quality Contracts. These people must not be let off the hook whilst things are amended in Parliament. Every day people are complaining about the poor bus services.

Just generally and very quickly on devolution, Councillor Blake did not give us any introductory remarks on where we are at. As far as I understand it when a proposal that can be agreed by the Conservative Members of Parliament and Conservative Group Leaders and Council Leaders can be brought forward we will probably progress, but until that time we probably will not.

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor David Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Firstly, I would like to join Councillor Wakefield in welcoming the House of Lords action on Clause 21. I think we need the facility to operate our own buses. The loss of that, even if we are franchising the fact is if the private sector do not step up to the plate and deliver, we have got to be able to do it ourselves and Nottingham do that, Blackpool do that, Edinburgh do that, several Local Authorities that are non-Met, but since those powers were taken off us some years ago when the County Council was done away with and deregulation came in we have not been able to do that and we need that ability. I am not specifically saying use it but we need that ability if it is necessary.

The only problem I have got with the Bus Bill from my understanding – and put me right if I am wrong on this but it was some officers from Metro when we were doing a consultation, on the various consultations that are going on at the moment – for us to get powers under the Bus Bill to do franchising, we would have to have an elected Mayor. We have said over and over again in this Chamber we are not for that, we want a properly accountable Authority, not an elected Mayor.

I will just give an example of what having one person in charge is. It just happened yesterday in America. Two hopeless people effectively, one who is very, very iffy and the other one that won that never told any truth in her life ever, that is an example of what you get if you just have one person. We want something that is collected and accountable and accountable to all the people of West Yorkshire.

Generally on devolution though, I have got to say, it is like watching paint dry because we do not seem to be getting anywhere. I am not particularly going blaming anybody, it might have to do with the referendum, it might have to do with the change of Prime Minister but we do not seem to be getting anywhere.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: I am sorry, David, but you are wrong. You do not have to have an elected Mayor to introduce bus franchising. If you have not an elected Mayor you have to get special authorisation from the Secretary of State. That is an entirely different thing.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Anyway, whatever, that is what the guys from Metro said and that is all I am going on.

COUNCILLOR: Well they are wrong.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: As I say, it has been like watching paint dry and I just wish we could get on with it because the fact is that is what we need in this area. Thank you. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Brian Cleasby.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Council, on page 111 at 3.2 in Project and Spending Approvals there is a reference to £33.4m and an £8.8m to Leeds City College. This actually relates, Councillor Mulherin, to Horsforth Campus that I was asking you questions about earlier, and it was me that asked the Freedom of Information request because I was staggered when through Planning, and I think the Chair at the time of the Planning Panel was quite staggered the speed and the energy with which housing approval was given to Horsforth Campus when I knew Horsforth School were working on a project with a view to taking it as a sixth form college.

The sale of the Horsforth Campus for housing was providing the money towards the £8.8m which allowed them to go forward for the £33.4m loan to build this city centre block that they are now building. Unfortunately what has happened as a consequence, Askham Bryan College are at this moment embedded in that campus. What we were working on with them was to have a sixth form offer which was far better than anybody in the Outer North West could have offered.

I am fully aware that at this moment there are 720 sixth formers in the three secondary schools on the A65. If you link that to the ring road as an access of transport for the kids, we are looking at in excess of 2,000 sixth formers. That means we could free up 2,000 spaces at our secondary schools without any new build but, more importantly, we could give all our schools therefore and our children an enhanced offer by bringing in horticulture and agriculture to the offer that the schools already provide. People tell me it is a no brainer.

I would hope that when somebody gets up to speak at the end of this she will then be able to tell us why the course of action was taken as it was to damage such a brilliant concept. Thank you, Council. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stewart Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am going to talk about the Combined Authority and its relationship to developing skills. One of the reasons why the Government decided that devolution was a good idea was because we were able to demonstrate that because of our local knowledge and networks we were far better placed to deliver better outcomes and one of those areas that we were best to do so was in skills. I have to say, it is one of the successes that we have got.

I am mentioning skills at this point because I am involved with the LGA and as part of that you do peer reviews and I went to a Local Authority recently – there

were two that were joining each other – and one it was an Adult Social Care peer review and one of the big pressures for those Authorities, because their economy had developed and done well but it meant that their unemployment rate was relatively low and there was a lot of competition for low entry, low skilled jobs. It meant that actually the pool of talent that they usually called upon to get employed with care providers, they were up against Centre Parks, they were up against leisure complexes and they were seen as being much better places to work than maybe in the care sector.

I am laying this down now. We need to be aware that if our economy is going to thrive and we are investing in those kind of economic regeneration models for our City Region, we will face those same pressures if we do not look forward and actually make sure that a career in care is something that is seen as a positive thing, it is something where we can actually develop and make it not a low skilled but actually a higher skilled profession to go into at a low entry because we actually have a career plan. I think part of that is going to be about developing that care economy so that those people who go into care are not just employees of a big, faceless corporation. They should be given the skills to potentially be those business owners and providers of the future where we can actually kill two birds with one stone and make sure that we do have that mixed care economy that we have talked about earlier in the day.
(applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Sandy Lay.

COUNCILLOR LAY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I shall be talking on the Scrutiny flooding response in relationship to my community in Otley but I would just like to say that I completely agree with Councillor Wakefield on Clause 21 and I am pleased to see that he made mention of it because I did have a question that we did not get to today, so it is nice to think that it would be good for the Council if it chose in future to run its own bus service.

Anyhow, I want to talk about flooding, really, and the response from the community in Otley. The community in Otley had been getting on with their flood response alleviation work really, and they had been working on two elements. They had been working with the City Council and the Environment Agency to ensure that we have a better understanding of where the gulleys and drains and the blockages are beside the Farnley Lane and Back Bridge and Bridge Avenue area. I am confident now, because officers tell us, that they think they have found all of the gulleys and that they are clear, so I am hoping going forward that we can ensure that there will be no further blockages this winter.

The second part that they are working on is, the Town Council are working with Oxford University to see what additional measures are needed to support those drains and gulleys. They are also working with the local community as well as the university to come up with community led modelling of flows. This model would be used to aid planning designs and implementation of upstream mitigation measures to reduce the run-off. The aim is to produce a scheme a bit like the one in Pickering, really.

Finally, the local Flood Study Group is due to have its first meeting on Friday with a report due by Easter. This report is actively supported by the EA and I know that elected Members and the community would like to see some reassurance from Council that it would be fully engaged in the project and that any clear measures

identified by the report will be acted upon swiftly by both the Council and the EA.
Thanks very much. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Colin Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Like everybody in the room I think, we all have this issue with the current bus service and particularly First Bus which seem to live in a world of their own. If you want to raise the issue of First Bus I will raise the X84 which seems to miss at least one journey every day; the 33A which is another bus service that seems to have a very poor reliability. Those are the ones that serve Otley. It is very difficult for anybody from Otley to rely on that particular bus service and I think franchising may be the option. I hope it is the option because it appears to work in London.

I would just counsel against those halcyon days when Leeds City Council or what was it in the old days, the LCT bus service because there were parts of the city that never saw one of those, we never saw a Leeds bus though we did understand there were these mysterious things that travelled round certain parts of Leeds.

Having said all that, I do think I would raise the issue, as Keith actually raised the issue of buses, in relation to the recent service changes. I am seriously concerned because at no time was there any consultation between ward Members and the Combined Authority about services that they were supporting and to be honest we found out about it when complaints started coming in. There have been a number of issues in relation to services, tendered services that actually I think if we had had that input before we would not be in the difficult situation we are now.

I will just touch on flooding because I do think I would put on record that the City Council employees have done some sterling work in fairly difficult circumstances because obviously if your house is flooded you are a little upset and they have been able to respond, I think, in a calm and appropriate manner. I would just flag up though that I feel that the Environment Agency response could have been better because I find it very difficult to actually find anybody in the Environment Agency who takes responsibility for various things. It is always somebody else or they have moved or they have transferred.

Up until it was suggested a couple of weeks ago that the responsibility for flooding be taken away from the Environment Agency I had not even thought about that but I am now beginning to take the view that it would be much better if we had a dedicated unit who could deal with this sort of situation rather than passing it between various departments. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Karen Bruce.

COUNCILLOR BRUCE: Thank you, my Lord Mayor. I am speaking on the Bus Bill. It is so frustrating that private bus companies can currently run services where they like, when they like. Services have been chopped and changed, they are missing, they are late and fares have gone up. I would love to see a London style franchise to take back control of buses through the Bus Bill. Many years ago, on my first job, in fact, I used to work for Metro and I saw first hand then how frustrating it is that private bus companies got to take control of our buses and a lot of directors got rich in the process – that is another story.

It was through Metro I did day release study and who do you think was one of my teachers? It was a young Councillor Keith Wakefield – a very good teacher too! In my view it was wrong then and it is wrong now. The root of a lot of the problems that we have with bus services, they go back to deregulation in 1986 when all we all want to do is put the passenger first.

Buses should be run primarily for the needs of residents and not just to line the pockets of fat cat bosses of huge bus companies, basically, who charge passengers a fortune for a very limited service and what we really need is to take back control and give residents the kind of service that they really deserve.

As local Councillors our hands are currently tied and we all know the frustrations of being totally powerless, really, to help when a bus service is desperately needed, like in Styebank Lane in Rothwell where we have elderly residents there who have to climb up a hill with their shopping and it is very difficult for them not having a bus service up there. It was withdrawn for commercial reasons.

David and I have worked hard to try and get the bus back and we have had help from colleagues, but just when we thought we were getting somewhere Arriva changed managers and you are back to square one.

At our Outer South Transport Conversation event, which I thought was really good, last week there were some great ideas from local residents and from our local Councillors as well, including the possibility of local interchanges which would mean that passengers do not have to always travel into the city centre and can connect and go into different communities throughout Leeds.

It would be great to have control over the network, to have the power to provide services where the need is and so people have a say in the services. To be able to offer proper ticketing where people can get whichever bus they want and not worry about it, what colour it is or which company runs it so you cannot get on it. Fair pricing as well so it is not cheaper to get a taxi or train. To be able to offer customers a more punctual and dependable service...

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR BRUCE: ...and, of course, reduce emissions in the city and in our localities. Thank you. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Blake to sum up.

COUNCILLOR BLAKE: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am really heartened that there have been so many contributions to this agenda item. To me it is a very important area and it is actually something that was mentioned during our peer review that we need to have more open dialogue discussing all the different partnership bodies that we have that are of relevance. I think the debate on buses, there have been some really good points made and just, Andrew, to say that through the consultation that we are having on transport, there are two separate items – there is the West Yorkshire and the Leeds, and buses are coming through so strongly so we will come back with our response to buses within Leeds particularly but also obviously through Councillor Wakefield through the whole West Yorkshire model.

The opportunity to mention flooding, Tom, I thought you made some really good points and Lucinda, Richard and myself were just at the launch of the Catchment Area Network that has been set up. The change that is happening about people really working together going down is very noticeable. I think there has been a step change there.

Picking up on Sandy's point, it is about relearning some of the skills that have just gone and the knowledge that has gone about the old engineering. I went out to Methley and Micklefield and some of the engineers out there are rediscovering how the old Victorian response to flooding actually worked and how some of them have been filled up with concrete and no longer work any more, so I think getting more local knowledge.

Just to reassure Council, all eight Leeds MPs plus myself and Tom Riordan went down to meet the Minister Therese Coffey and we will not let the pressure off Government in terms of the commitment because exactly right too often the floods disappear and then they do not and the idea that the funding is reliant on the value of the properties along the rivers is just not acceptable.

Can I say that, Stewart, inclusive growth is rising up the agenda, it is coming, the Combined Authority is starting to look at how they can look at the softer sides of infrastructure, development, skills, access to work, all of the support that we need to do is a really important issue that we need to pick up.

Just to reassure everyone, the devolution debate is not dead. What we have had is a completely new Government coming in with key changes in personalities and the difference in approach between George Osborne and Phillip Hammond, for example, is something that we are getting to understand but very happy to talk to anyone who would like to sit down and see if there are any further opportunities in the lobbying that we are intending to do. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. All those in favour of the Minutes. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

WHITE PAPERS

THE LORD MAYOR: Procedural motion to be moved by Councillor Lamb. Is there a seconder for it?

COUNCILLOR LAMB: I would like to move that under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 22.1 that Council Procedure Rule 3.4 be suspended to allow all speakers on White Paper one in the name of Councillor Andrew Carter to be heard and I request a recorded vote please, Lord Mayor.

THE LORD MAYOR: Is there a seconder for that?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Seconded, Lord Mayor.

(A recorded vote was held on the Procedural Motion in the name of Councillor Lamb)

THE LORD MAYOR: There are 94 present; “Yes” in favour 92; against 2; abstain zero. That is CARRIED.

ITEM 13 – WHITE PAPER MOTION - PLANNING

THE LORD MAYOR: White Paper, Councillor Andrew Carter.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In moving the White Paper in my name can I first of all say I shall be accepting Councillor Campbell’s amendment, I shall be accepting Councillor Leadley’s amendment, I shall be accepting Councillor Anderson’s amendment which we tabled in order to remove any obstacle from the Labour Party feeling they could also vote with the resolution. I am sorry to say we will not be supporting the Labour Party amendment because shall we refer to it at the moment as the Pontius Pilate amendment, “Not us gov” in their language.

When we went for the Core Strategy who decided that we should go to inquiry with a target of 70,000 net houses? Who did it? They did, right. Was it the Government? No, it was not. Was it the Coalition Government? No, it was not. It was Labour controlled Leeds City Council. Irrefutable fact, cannot get away from it.

Every other group in the Council went to that inquiry along with community groups all over the city and argued against it for a variety of reasons which we will not go into at the moment but pretty much we were all unanimous that this figure was at least 10,000, possibly 15,000 overstated and that to go with a figure like that would end in tears, and it has.

Very unkindly I thought the Leader of the Council inferred that Councillor Gruen today made the only sensible statement he has ever made in his life! *(laughter)* I think that is very unkind! I can think of another one which I will give you – there are only two and this is the second one! Eighteen months ago Councillor Gruen, who was then in charge of Planning (I am not sure who is in charge of it now, Councillor Lewis certainly is not) Councillor Gruen told us we had a five year land supply – actually he said a six year land supply, we had a six year land supply, he did - he said we were on track to get the Site Allocations Plan to the Secretary of State this autumn – it is now this winter, it is still not there. He also said they were going to start reviewing the numbers. Wrong, wrong, wrong. Eighteen months later none of those things have happened. Richard, you have been in charge for 18 months, tell us all what has gone on and, please, stand up and admit if your department is in chaos, tell us it is in chaos, that it is another shambles in this Authority that your administration is presiding over.

I will give you a bit of other information as well. Back in March of this year a group called the Local Plan Expert Group brought out a report which went to Government. It said in Figure 1 that Leeds, Bradford and Wakefield were using housing targets that had an over-provision of some hundreds of houses a year. It also went on to say that the removal of the need to align housing need calculations with economic forecasts was important because Local Authorities of the Leeds City Region had done that and there was no centrally accepted forecast; such calculations also lead to higher figures than can be considered realistically. On the population projections you were wrong and you over provided. On the employment projections

you were woefully optimistic. Edge Analytics gave you three separate bands of employment growth over the planned period. You took the highest. This report says you should not have been taking any of them.

On every count the reason we are in the position we are in is your 70,000 houses. If you want me to criticise the Government I gladly will because the NPPF in my view, is potentially a very good document; one fatal flaw which we have already written to the Government about, by the way, on numerous occasions and just written again. It hands the delivery of houses to a handful of housing builders. That cannot be right, it cannot work for the delivery of the housing numbers they want and it also puts at risk needlessly areas of land that could be protected. I am afraid to say, wriggle any way you want, the start and end of the problem in Leeds is the 70,000 figure you lot decided to put in, suspiciously close to the figure that last Labour Government imposed upon us. I wonder why. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Procter.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Tom Leadley.

COUNCILLOR LEADLEY: I am moving my amendment, my Lord Mayor. we thought that Councillor Carter might have accepted our amendment graciously and he has done that. It is not merely a quibble; 4,000 homes at ten to the acre would take up 400 acres of green belt or urban green space. Numbers surrounding the housing target must be precisely stated and properly understood. We must have accurately drawn baselines before we begin to move forward. Those numbers are quite straightforward. It is hard to see how many have made such heavy weather of them for so long.

The Opposition parties were not alike in criticising the LDF housing targets. Some were more equal than others. Councillor Carter may be trying to catch up to where we were in Morley some years ago. By far the best chance that we had to deal with the inflating housing target came in the spring of 2013 when the bulk of the Census 2011 figures were published, just in time to be incorporated into the Leeds LDF Draft core Strategy about to be submitted for public examination. Revision need not have taken more than a month. More than 95% of the draft was perfectly sound and should have been used as a template or spreadsheet into which new figures could have been quickly fed, followed by careful editing to make sure that consequent changes to the text matched it. It was not necessary to tear the Core Strategy up and start again, as Councillor Charlwood has claimed.

When I proposed such revisions at full Council in the spring of 2013 I was grateful for the support of MBI, Green and Liberal Democrat colleagues. The Conservative Group did not support that strategy, probably because we had thought of it first.

Some Labour colleagues were still in a fantasy world in which you would throw your bedroom curtains back one morning and find 74,000 houses that had been built in the middle of the night, probably by fairies, certainly not by the Home Builders Federation.

In the spring of 2013 we could have seized the initiative and revised from a position of strength. Now we face retreating in weakness, having failed to come anywhere near the first five years of the slow start housing that was asked for by the City Council and conceded with some reluctance by the Core Strategy Inspector.

Close study shows that the new dwelling numbers achieved since the LDF clock started running in April 2012 are far worse than might be thought at first sight. Many of the new dwellings are not new at all, they are old houses which have been recycled under the Empty Homes Strategy, 755 of them in 2015/16. Something must be done about this. DCLG have said that our five year land supply buffer must be raised from 5% to 20%, in effect six years' supply, because of the failure to meet targets. When the slow start ends in 2017 the five year accumulated deficit will have to be snowballed in, adding to targets which might as well be shown as a vertical line on a graph going forward to 2028 for what difference it will make.

The danger is that the Leeds Planning Authority will be brought into special measures, as was the Education Authority some years ago, because of persistent failure to achieve those numbers and be administered directly by the Planning Inspectorate. We would lose control of the future of our own city.

My Lord Mayor, you will not be surprised to hear that as usual we in Morley are well in front of the game. Our Site Allocations Formal submission made almost exactly a year ago set out detailed and closely calculated strategies for escaping from the current housing numbers spinning roundabout.

We would adopt a closely argued, ambitious and reasonable target of building 50,000 new homes by 2028 based on real need and saving most if not all of the green belt and precious urban green spaces by means of carefully considered measures.

Really the maths behind all this is quite straightforward. We need a quick agreement to go for new figures and rapid action to apply them. Our Members of Parliament must be brought on board. We may need a genuinely all party delegation to DCLG in London to convince officials and Ministers that new numbers must be built into the Site Allocations Process or an immediate Core Strategy review stemming from it. All party must mean all party; it must not be any group misleadingly described as cross party which would exclude deliberately those who have made the running in these matters in the past.

We need to conclude the debate about numbers and go forward to improve the quality of the places in which we live and to build more social rented housing rather than wasting effort in pursuit of unachievable quantity. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Robert Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: In seconding the amendment in the name of Councillor Leadley I will just make a few comments. It is often felt, I think, that because we come from Morley we are less sophisticated than the other political groups that grace Leeds City Council. *(laughter)* Thank you very much! Why do we think that? Because we tend to look through many of the vanity projects that this city Council consistently supports and fails to actually deliver.

In fact, if I remember rightly we were the only group going back to the early 2000s who felt that Supertram was never going to run and never run it did, costing us £40m. We had a similar view about NGT and we were very clear about the fact that we did not feel that that was going anywhere and we were proven right yet again and subsequently wasted quite a lot of time and money on a project that got absolutely nowhere.

The third issue is that there was this obsession, this vanity project, certainly from our colleagues to our left who felt that they were going to build loads and loads and loads of houses and set a target that was unrealistic and unachievable. Certainly they took the Regional Spatial Strategy, which I think Ed Balls had something to do with it, if I remember my history at this particular point, with this unachievable, ridiculous, bonkers target and transcribed that into where we are at this particular point. That means that we all suffer – we have certainly suffered substantially in Morley because of that. We have had somewhere in the region of about 1,000 houses on green field sites primarily because we had been in a situation where we have not been able to defend our position. We have not been able to defend that position because the targets are too high. This allows the developers to pick and choose where they develop and it actually means that what they actually do provide is four bedroom executive style housing in green field sites and not the affordable homes that we would all want to see provided.

On top of that we would also say that what it does do is direct limited funds away from brown field sites and make sure that that is focused on green field sites. This was another vanity project, we need to get it into review as quickly as we can.

Councillor Leadley has consistently argued that the targets should be somewhere in the region of 50,000. We absolutely fully support that. Indeed, only by supporting such a sensible target can we actually make sure that our green field sites, which are precious in Morley and are precious across the rest of the Leeds City Council, are protected. I formally second. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Colin Campbell to move a second amendment.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Before I start could I just say a big thank you to whoever it was over on this side who leaked the Councillors all email address to the Members of the public and allowed us all to get those really interesting emails, many of which actually raised some very interesting points I would say and so can I say thank you for that.

I think, Lord Mayor, as Andrew has touched on, the issue is the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy is the thing that has hamstrung us, if that is the best word to use, so the five year land supply was never achievable, the Core Strategy figures were never achievable but because we continued on against all opposition to adopt those figures, I think that we have made a rod for our own back, we are where we are, we are in a very difficult position and quite frankly there are a number of sites across the city which will go for housing which did not need to go because we have no longer a defensible position.

There are one or two new Members on that side – one over here, I think – and I would just like to quote you a couple of figures because it is not as though you were

not warned about this. Let me take you back to 2012. In February 2012, just as we were about as a Council to accept the Core Strategy, Councillor Leadley put a reference back to Council saying what we need to do is to ensure that before we actually adopt the Core Strategy we wait until we have got the accurate figures, the accurate population figures, the accurate employment figures. OK, fine, seems to me quite sensible because all we wanted to do was to delay it for one cycle of Council – one cycle of Council, six weeks, all right?

I will give you a couple of quotes:

“Lord Mayor, it is ludicrous to have a reference back on this today. There is no need for it.”

Another one:

“This Core Strategy, and I honestly did not think I would be saying this, Lord Mayor, offers one of the best ways to, dare I say it, limit development in all our wards.” *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR: Name them!

COUNCILLOR: Yes, name them!

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: We have got an echo in here! I think the issue, Lord Mayor, is rather than accept that short delay of six weeks when the figures were published we found out that we had made a mistake and nobody after that – well, nobody *here* – or sorry, nobody *there*, everybody *here* knew it but nobody over *there* would there - would admit they had got it wrong.

So, we are in this ludicrous situation – and it is a ludicrous situation – that we are attempting to defend the loss of green belt and the loss is down to our own making. Well, not our own making, part of our own making.

All those emails that I have got, all those emails that you have got, I do not believe for a minute any of you emailed back and said “Sorry, put our hands up, it was our fault.” It will all be the Government’s fault, the Opposition’s fault, the Coalition’s fault, you name it, the House Builders Federation’s Fault. It will not be the fault of the people who are really responsible. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ryk Downes.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In seconding the second amendment I would like to make the following observations.

Councillor Carter mentioned about the inquiry. I actually attended two days worth of the inquiry. The first one I did was about transport and infrastructure and this Council’s officers said they had not done an Impact Assessment and they were not going to, on the area of Aireborough which I partly represent. I found that amazing because the targets that they are setting are unsustainable for the locations that they are proposing.

The second day I went to a hearing at Leeds Museum and on one side of the table there was about at least a dozen or more property developers, all there stating their case and they were saying “We need 70,000. We absolutely need this figure and the reason was, it is too expensive to build on brown field sites so therefore we need the green field sites to be included so what we will do is we will build those first and then we will build the brown field sites and we will make the money on the green field.”

The reality is, because of what Councillor Campbell said, the fact is that the population figures were taken from estimates, wildly inaccurate. We said that, when we saw them, they look too high. The 2011 census proved that we were right and they were too high, they should have been revised downwards and so what happens is the developers are not able to build out towards 70,000, they never were going to be able to because it is too high a figure, so what they do is they build green field sites and leave a lot of the brown field sites and the windfall sites that come along and so that is just a crazy way of doing things.

The other thing is, if you take my own ward – and this is proof that you can build – we have got a former paper mill, Garnett’s, and that is currently being built on at the moment, a brown field site, no industry could be found to take up the old mill site and that is being built out now. Just recently completed is the old hospital site on xYoulcarr and that has been built, and that is the right way of doing things. If you cannot find further industry and employment then turn those areas into housing to meet the housing needs, but all we are seeing now is developers rubbing their hands because they are making as much money as they can and nobody will stand up to them.

I am afraid to say that the Members over there will not know this because not one of them was at these two days of hearing that I attended and so how can you possibly know what is happening?

The other thing is, Councillor Campbell mentioned the emails. My system was unable to calculate how many I received. Every time I tried to count it another one came in and it refiled and everything...:

COUNCILLOR: They are still coming in.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: ...they are still coming in now, I estimate between 500 and 600. I have sent a reply back to every single one of them because I think they deserve a reply and there were a lot of really good, well thought out arguments there and I have to say I support every one of them and these figures really do need revising, they need revising downwards so that we can protect our green field. Thank you. *(applause)*

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

COUNCILLOR B ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In proposing my amendment, just to reiterate what Councillor Carter said, the idea behind my amendment was to make it easier for you to support it so we would have an all party way forward. Councillor Carter even gave you advance notice that we had submitted the White Paper and he would like to be involved in discussions with you. You did

not take it up. Were you all aware that this offer had been made to you? Some of you might have been but I think some of you probably were not made aware that this offer had been made by us to try and work together so that we could get a cross party consensus today, which we are not going to get now, only because of you. Yet again, you are the ones who are being complacent, you are the ones who think you know best, you are the ones who think it is OK to go on dictating to people to do this, that and the other despite evidence being given to you to the contrary over the ONS figures, over your population growth as well. You will not listen.

This afternoon we have had a number of debates where exactly the same thing has happened. You just will not listen to what people tell you, what residents are telling you. Forget about politicians telling you, the residents in your communities are telling you, whether it be Garforth or whether it be Ardsley and Robin Hood, or in Kippax, these residents are telling you.

COUNCILLOR: How do you know?

COUNCILLOR B ANDERSON: It is your residents; they are not our residents, they are your residents who are telling you that you have got your housing figures wrong. You can complain as much as you like, you are totally 100% responsible for getting it wrong. You are 100% responsible for us losing appeal after appeal now on green field sites because you will refuse to address the issue that is in front of you which is your targets are undeliverable. They are just not achievable in any shape or form. Even Councillor Gruen was willing to accept that when he was in charge, that it was going to be very difficult and challenging to do it. Don't you listen to your own Members when they are even telling you these sort of things?

It is important that we have this debate. It is important that we take it out to the community and explain to them because the residents, why do you think we got inundated with all of these emails? Because people, and they are not just all from your supposed Conservative areas, I received a lot from Garforth, I have received them from all over the place.

COUNCILLOR GABRIEL: Did you get any from Boston Spa?

COUNCILLOR B ANDERSON: If you actually look at the address of them, people are concerned. Why are people asking you to support it today? You are going to ignore them, you are going to ignore the residents because you think you are so clever, you know it all, you are the ones who get it right all the time and everybody else gets it wrong. *(interruption)*

It is unbelievable your arrogance and the way that you approach and the contempt that you hold the electorate in this city, the residents that you say you represent. You do not represent them when you continually operate ostrich politics all over the place. Please support my amendment and the White Paper in the name of Councillor Carter. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we just have a little bit of sssshhh – quiet.
Councillor Latty.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Lord Mayor, in supporting Councillor Anderson's amendment I am going to take the focus away a bit and, as you might have expected, get a bit more local.

We are talking about 70,000 houses and I confess I find 70,000 houses a little bit hard to visualise but I can visualise 2,300 houses. That is 2,300 houses which, if all this goes ahead, are going to be built in my corner of the world, and I can visualise 2,300 houses because we have already built two and a half thousand over the last twelve years, so I know what it can do.

Part of the principle behind the Core Strategy or at least the development of building in our communities is not to join communities up, not to build on green belt, to provide infrastructure where we are proposing to build and I can certainly say that in terms of Aireborough we are going to build on green belt if this goes ahead because we have nowhere else to build houses, but we are not planning any infrastructure because there is nowhere to put infrastructure. We are going to join up townships and we are in great danger of joining Leeds on to Bradford if we are not careful, because they are building up to our boundary and we are drifting that way very, very rapidly. It is happening in Councillor Carter's ward, it is happening in other places so we are flouting the rules, as you might say, here.

I say there is going to be no infrastructure – we are going to build houses for people who are going to live somewhere where there are no extra roads to get them to move around, there are no schools for their children to go to because we are not planning any, there are no job opportunities because we are not planning any employment sites.

COUNCILLOR: We cannot build any schools.

COUNCILLOR G LATTY: We are going to have people who are going to have to travel to work. Where is that work going to be? In Leeds. What do they do? They get in their cars. What do we get? We get pollution. We are getting all the things that we do not want (*interruption*) we are not building for people, we are building for dogma, we are building here because you have decided we need to build all these houses.

That is just one small part of Leeds and you can replicate that all over, replicate it in your own wards. Garforth are going to get this sort of thing, Kippax are going to get it, and it is going to change the face of Leeds as we know it. You cannot build a few houses without changing things but if we only bring this figure down to sensible proportions it means that each of us will get less and that can only be a good thing for the people who live there.

I started talking by saying I was going to talk about smaller communities. What this is going to do to Aireborough and to Kippax and to Garforth and to all the other places is destroy community. We are taking away what people value and we are not putting anything in its place. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Richard Lewis.

COUNCILLOR: Save us!

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Can I just start off by talking about the email, the cyber attack. I look across at young Councillor Stephenson over there and I am sure his name came up somewhere in those early emails. I think he is too fresh faced to have been involved in such a little scam as sending us all 500 emails but seriously, I believe people should be able to express themselves. However, for those people who wanted to contact us urgently about urgent issues, it was very, very unhelpful.

One thing I picked up from those emails, the early ones, was a comment about there was an anomaly in the housing land supply figures and that was the cause of the problem. Well, if that is an anomaly the whole in Sir Philip Green's BHS pension fund is an anomaly.

The basic problem with NPPF, and Andrew, you said it yourself, it has a fatal flaw but it has actually got more than one fatal flaw. The main fatal flaw is its philosophy is that you give as much land as you possibly can for developers to build on and then they will build more than they have to meet some fictitious national target. Look, I am not saying that in a kind of party political way because our party has been as guilty as your party of coming up with figures for what we will build and what we will not build. I am happy to say that because we have got to learn lessons as well as you but you need to learn some as well.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: That will be the day.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: If we are talking about Pontius Pilate, whose NPPF is it? It is not Peter Gruen's NPPF. It is not Keith Wakefield's, Judith's or mine. It is yours and it is yours that spells out that philosophy that give them land to build on and let them do it. You skewer us on a figure because you have all talked, and I say that for people who I have respect for over on this side, as if you could come up with a figure of 50,000 and it would have got through a public inquiry. There is no guarantee of that. Andrew, you were in the room the other day when we got advice from a disinterested party.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Be careful.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: You might not have ended up with your wonderful 55 or 60,000, you might have ended up with more because what were the developers pressing for? They were pushing for 92,000.

Why couldn't we support you in what you put forward? Very obviously because what you say is well, the NPPF is OK. How can we possibly – you knew that we could never support that absolutely. Come on, Andrew, don't be silly, stop being the Pontius Pilate. I won't play kind of panto with you but you are skewered, any Local Authority is skewered on numbers. It is forced in one direction by the formal inquiry process and then it has to meet an annual target. Who is not helping us meet the annual target? It is not the smaller and medium sized builders, it is not the Council doing its bit to bring empty homes back into use. It is your big boys, it is the same people, the ones who are happy to support the Tory Party financially year after year.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: The Labour Party more like.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Like Taylor Wimpey do you mean?

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: Come off it. Come off it, John.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Baroness Brenda Dean, on the board of Wimpey. That's who is in charge here, it is Labour.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: If you are starting, John, which of you over there in the Wetherby and Harewood end actually supports Parlington because it ain't so many weeks ago it was all what you wanted and what your colleague over there is saying is the opposite...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It is rude to point.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: ... and he is winding people up to send us emails. Let us have some unity from you lot instead of this hypocrisy and nonsense. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Neil Walshaw. Follow that!

COUNCILLOR WALSHAW: I second the amendment in the name of Councillor Richard Lewis. Really, I am going to have some difficulty following that but I shall endeavour to try.

Once we get aside from the panto and we have pushed that to one side, what I see when I look at these White Papers actually is, yes, there are issues that either side cannot support and that is to be sure and Richard has just explained one of those, but actually there is an awful lot in this room which we all agree on, isn't there? Let us all nod – yes, there is.

As a Plans Chair I am going to say a few things of where I see it and, I would just say as a Plans Chair I would never prejudice an application or a site so I have got my legal disclaimer in there. Let us look at where we agree. A review of housing numbers has already started; you know that, we know that. That is fine.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: When?

COUNCILLOR WALSHAW: Yes it has because we sat in the room with officers and they have been doing the work. You know that and I know that, everyone on this side and that side knows that.

We all agree that the five year land supply policy as set out in the NPPF does not work, and it does not, it is a ridiculous lever on Local Authorities and our communities, a lever to force house building, a lever to really steer housing development through and it is not working, is it? Why do we know it is not working? Because we have not been delivering. We have not been delivering but it is not "we", is it, as Councillor Lewis has pointed out, it is volume house builders, they are not delivering, so I am glad to see that the Tory party is gradually realising the fact that in terms of housing capitalism in that respect is not working, is it?

I want to talk about what is happening in this city at the moment. In this city we have got as of now around 22,500 outstanding unbuilt planning permissions. That

is 22,500 houses that have got planning permission that have not been built. That is not acceptable, is it, to us in this city, that is unacceptable for our communities and it is unacceptable to us looking forward. We all know that in this Chamber, don't we? There is an awful lot we agree on.

Why are people not delivering? Because the structure of the industry is wrong. The way it finances itself is wrong. There are not enough major actors in it, there are not enough medium sized actors in it. It is not delivering and the sad thing is, the frustrating thing, perhaps for every Member in this room – I would hope it is every Member in this room – with only small changes to Government policy we could end the housing crisis in Leeds. For example, I will give you two examples. If capital controls were lifted on major Local Authorities with good credit ratings – and remember, folks, our credit rating is better than HM Treasury's currently – if capital controls were lifted and some amendments were made to regulations you would not even need primary legislation, we could have a massive public house building programme in this city. Do you know what, the private sector would stampede to fund that public sector housing programme. We could build sustainable communities that addressed all our needs but because of ideology apparently we are not allowed to do that because David Cameron and George Osborne were worried about creating Labour voters. Do you know what I worry about? I worry about housing everyone in this city and I worry about housing future generations in this city.

The focus point of what is not working is the NPPF. As Richard has pointed out, the focus on land supply being the only determinant and nothing else matters – not the economy, not finance, not the structure of the industry. That is unacceptable to us and we all need to lobby to have that change.

If only you guys had some direct line to Government you could utilise that would be excellent, because it is not working, is it? It is really not working, Lord Mayor, it is there for all to see and that is why I shall be supporting Councillor Lewis's amendment. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor David Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillor Walshaw is right, we do need houses for our people, the right kind of houses and in the right place but the 70,000 does not reflect anything about this. This is an argument with volume house builders who want to build upmarket houses on the green belt and the 70,000 figure actually allows them to do that and is a worry I have had all along since we were doing this. Even if we have not had our current problems when the land was put on deposit for Phase 2 and 3, what we call Phase 2 and 3, somebody was going to come along and put a planning application, we would turn it down, they would appeal and then the world would open and every green field site in the city will get built on and none of the brown field. It has happened before, it happened with UDP, never mind with this. It has happened with every various Government and it is all right giving the present Tory Government a kick because it actually wants a kick, but the previous Labour Government was just as bad on housing numbers.

It seems to me that you get down to Parliament and you get these volume builders come and lobby you and you lose track of all reality. To do 70,000 in the time limit we are talking about, we have never built as many houses in this city ever

and that includes when we were doing the city centre which was easier. We do not need them, we do not know, the population is wrong and they are the actual wrong kind of houses because what we need is low cost rented houses, not loads of four bedroom houses on the outskirts of the city. That is what we need and we are not going to get it with this.

This needs reviewing, it needs pulling down to a reasonable level and it needs to get down to some reality and that is what we are lacking, whether the reality is in here or down in Westminster. Thank you. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Matthew Robinson.

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am very pleased to support the White Paper motion in the name of Councillor Carter and the amendments from the Liberal Democrats and from the MBIs as well. I would like to take this opportunity to also welcome – and yours, sorry, Councillor Anderson as well, and our amendment. I would like to take this opportunity as well to congratulate Linton for their Neighbourhood Development Plan which has got through, a Neighbourhood Development Plan that the community there funded themselves, they were not on any of the special streamlines from the Council to get a Neighbourhood Development Plan through, they have fought a long time to make sure that their NDP is in place and they have actually got one in place now so I would like to put on record my congratulations to that group.

The figure has gone far beyond a joke. We find ourselves forced to look at sites that we would not normally even want to consider. The population figures are wrong, the ONS figures that have been produced go and vindicate this, I think we have to accept as well, given the referendum in the summer, that there will be an effect of Brexit on population figures as we move forward as well, it will have an impact on growth in this city whether it is up or down and that will need to be factored in.

We also need to make sure that we use accurate figures. I think each and every speaker so far has mentioned using accurate figures. The worry for me is that we have actually given the whip hand over to the developers by actually supporting 70,000. We have actually given away any sort of bargaining power that was ever there for us.

It is impossible to achieve these figures; not in the best years of boom were developers ever producing these sort of numbers. I could be perfectly happy if there were lower housing numbers and we worked our way up. Actually, we are doing the reverse, we are going for the top end and trying to work our way down. It is completely the wrong way around.

In terms of reviewing this I understand from what Councillor Walshaw is saying that a review is happening, it is on its way. It needs to come forward with far greater urgency right now and be completed ASAP. We do not have a deadline for when that will be finished, we have not seen that deadline and that has not been issued or been publicised to the hundreds of people who I have to say you should look at their postcodes and you should look at their emails properly...

COUNCILLOR: We have.

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: ...because they are saying to us that they are not just supporting one party, they are not just supporting Opposition parties in this Chamber, they are from all sorts of backgrounds, from all sorts of communities and they are coming out with one message – the 70,000 figures is too high.

What I think is that we have all gone and said that brown field should come forward first. In my own community in Harewood ward there is a brown field site coming forward. We have positively encouraged that and talked with the community about that brown field site and opened up what the opportunities of brown field are. Brown field opens up regeneration opportunities, it opens up job opportunities, it opens up transport opportunities. I know that Councillor Lewis says that we do not actually have a transport problem in this city but I am afraid we do.

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: I did not say that, Matthew. Do not believe what you read in the Evening Post.

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: I hope our Evening Post journalists see that because Councillor Lewis said do not believe what you read in the Evening Post and it was in the rest of Johnson Press as well. I think what we need to make sure is that we factor in any sort of transport plans into any developments that we bring forward as well.

I am also very pleased to see that land banking has been put in not just our White Paper but all of the White Papers as well. The use of land banking is actually a bigger blight long term for this city. It risks not just this five year housing land supply but five year housing land supplies for ever and a day.

I am not sure, Lord Mayor, in my time if I have ever been in favour of a tax going up but I will tell you what I am in favour of, I am in favour of a charge coming in for developers that do not do their job, do not do what they say and are not delivering the housing numbers that they are supposed to deliver. I am afraid that I cannot support the Labour amendment but what I can support is Councillor Carter's White Paper. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ryan Stephenson.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Just for the record, Councillor Lewis, you made reference to my young age. It would be remiss of me to not get into an argument on that one with you but for the record, this email that has gone round, I think you will find if you search my email server, if you get the FBI in they can have a look through my email server, you will not find a single email which gives that email address out. I merely suggested that people might want to lobby their Councillors and for you to refer to it as a cyber attack, it is a real shame that you do because you do not want to respond to people who pay your wages, Councillor Lewis.

If you read all 500 of those emails you will see quite clearly the request from residents across this city, across the city, is for the administration to put politics aside and back this motion. What have you done? You have come forward with an amendment that is all about politics. We have even watered down our amendment to remove the politics from it and you still will not back it.

You talk about it all being the fault of the Secretary of State and Conservative MPs. Thankfully in some parts of the city we have hardworking Members of Parliament, such as Pudsey, Elmet and Rothwell, who have been lobbying Ministers for quite some time now. Back in March 2015 we had a response from a Planning Minister and I will just take the liberty to read it out, Lord Mayor:

“Local Planning Authorities have the statutory responsibility for planning and development matters in their areas. The general approach of the Secretary of State is not to interfere with the jurisdiction of Authorities.”

I am not going to enter into the political argument that you have created on your side but it is clear it is there for all to see. Those 500 emails were not about any one site. It was not a NIMBY approach from any one community, it was from across the city in Garforth, in Kippax, in Horsforth, in all sorts of communities. It was about the principle of the target that you are forcing through a higher target, an over inflated target on to green field and green belt land across this city and the root cause of that is your housing target. That was the request from residents in those emails and it is a disgrace that the administration here today will sit here and refer to them in such negative terms when residents, electors in this city, are asking you quite sensibly to put politics aside and back the White Paper in the name of Councillor Andrew Carter.

You have an opportunity to vindicate the arguments of those people. I urge you to back that White Paper today because the pressure that is coming in on green field and green belt land across this city is purely caused by that housing target. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Caroline Gruen.

COUNCILLOR C GRUEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am speaking in support of Councillor Lewis’s amendment and, as has been mentioned several times in this debate around the Chamber, we have all received many hundreds of emails calling for a reduction in the housing target.

I want you to imagine that you are playing a game of I’m thinking of a number but instead of thinking of a number between one and ten, I would like you to think of a number between one and 150,000. Not only do I want you to tell me the number, I want you all to agree on the same number and demonstrate to me why you think it is the right number, but I am not going to tell you whether it is right or whether it is wrong or give you any clue about what is expected.

If that sounds familiar, that is exactly the process that Councils have to go through to arrive at a Core Strategy with a housing target. There are no nationally agreed criteria, no process, no guidance. The first time that you know it is probably wrong is when you are told to go away and do it again.

Local Authorities actually have no choice but to do the best job they can when assessing need. The perspectives of different stakeholders are taken into account, developers will rarely if ever argue that the target is too high whilst local communities will often hope it can be reduced.

The Local Authority is the only one who is held to account on those figures. They are robustly tested and often to destruction. There surely has to be a better system with an established way to assess need, rather than a guessing game with real impacts on local communities.

We have to be clear that Leeds achieved the remarkable feat of convincing an Inspector its assessment of housing was accurate the first time around. Councils have tried and failed to do this – look at Harrogate, who were told in 2014 to go away and have another try. They do not have a local plan in place yet. Look at Kirklees – their plan withdrawn in 2013 because the Housing Inspector said the number was too low, still trying to get a plan in place. Look at York with their reduced figures yet to receive any support from an Inspector.

This is not a sustainable approach. Those Authorities without a plan are vulnerable to developers cherry-picking sites instead of having a robust means of ensuring quality and equality in their planning system. It is no good blaming Local Authorities either as the current system does for struggling with this opaque and ambiguous system. This simpler, quicker, cheaper and less bureaucratic system set down in the 2010 Planning Green Paper just is not there. Instead, we continue to play this silly guessing game that I have described.

On top of that the Planning system fails to give sufficient weight to everyone who has an interest in shaping the future. Whilst ever it remains in the interest of developers to restrict their build out rates through land banking in favour of building on green belt, the views of Councils and their communities will be largely disregarded.

So what is needed is a consistent, fair, reliable and transparent process by which Councils can assess their actual housing need. It needs to be based on specific criteria and agreed process and underpinned by clear guidance on how to go about doing this. That, in my view, would make things quicker, simpler and fairer.

So no, I do not generally welcome the NPPF. I think what might have been laudable aims have been overwhelmed by a process that gives Inspectors powers that can be use almost arbitrarily. As it is the only game in town we do have to play it while it exists. However, serious changes are needed and that is why I support Councillor Lewis's amendment. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stuart McKenna.

COUNCILLOR S MCKENNA: Lord Mayor, I am speaking in support of Councillor Richard Lewis's amendment. As Lead Member for Planning I get the opportunity to see the application process from many sides. I sit in Plans Panels and many Plans Panels, as most of you know, and listen to concerned residents and developers. As Plans Members we have to make decisions based on the information available to us but we, of course, understand the impact that the proposed development can have on people's lives. An understanding of this impact is seen throughout our Core Strategy and other local development documents. That is why there is an emphasis on building on brown field land and we have sought to try and ensure development is mixed and sustainable with infrastructure improvements needed to confirm development.

These things only come into play if an Authority has a Core Strategy and if they have a five year housing land supply. Without that developers can appeal, successfully in many cases, and have sensible refusal reversed. Imagine seeing this from residents' perspectives – they put together their objection to a new development, attend our Plans Panel and at the meeting they have a reasoned debate as Members look in detail at the application and compare this to the Core Strategy, the emerging Site Allocations Plan and the other policies we have as a Council. That is what we do week in, week out. From the discussion on the annual report earlier today I hope you can agree that, as a whole, we are good at it and we seek to do a professional job.

You can only imagine what a relief they have when an unsustainable application is refused but sadly in many cases that is just the start of the process. The developer can appeal and instead of the balance of our discussion the appeal can all hinge on the Council's five year land supply, so everything we have done as a city comes to nothing if the developers argue we do not have this, which is happening.

Frankly it makes a mockery of the process. What is the point of trying hard both as a Council and as individual Plans Panel Members to seek truly sensitive and balanced development if all developers need to do is talk about how quickly their own and other developments will be built.

It is not fair on our communities, it is not fair on us as a Council and it is not fair on future residents who will not have the infrastructure we have insisted on and had permission granted by the Council.

The key issue is paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Forum. If we do not have a five year land supply then nothing else matters. I think this is a ridiculous situation and we should have been working to resolve it.

The other thing, I have listened to everyone, every single person and I have to say my little mate David Blackburn over there made some good comments, but the one thing is, there is a review on the housing numbers and that is why I think we should all be supporting the Labour group amendment. Up there there are probably people that have come to listen to this debate and on the webcam and I spoke to Councillor Lewis earlier on and every single person that has emailed in will be getting a response.

I think Councillor Carter's suggestion is a first step but does not go nearly far enough. That is why we need to have far more vision and a more robust conversation with Central Government. That is why I am supporting Councillor Lewis's amendment. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor John Procter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In June of this year the people of this country sent a message to the political classes. Yesterday the US population sent a message to their political classes. What the people of this city have been doing, some of them at least, over the last handful of days is corresponding with their elected representatives and letting you and us know what they feel about this very important issue.

What do you do today? Your leadership recognised this is an important issue and that is why they instructed all of you to vote to hear all of the speakers. Many of you, however, think this is an irrelevant matter and one you want to belittle, hence some of your comments earlier.

It is important; it is important to many people in many areas not just represented by this side but also many people who represent Labour wards or live in other wards which will be affected by development.

Some of us have been telling you there is a problem with the housing numbers for a long time and many of you sat on the Scrutiny Board that I chaired back in 2011 that came up with a very considered report. It was described by the then Leader of Council, Councillor Wakefield, as one of the best Scrutiny reports ever produced. What did we say? We said that we should review immediately the housing target numbers.

Why did we say that? We said that because what we knew, and what many of you do not know is that, as Councillor Andrew Carter has mentioned, Edge Analytics, the consultants that were brought in to deal with this on behalf of the Council, presented a range. They presented a range to officers and effectively it was the officers who decided where we would fall within that range. It then got your endorsement and there started the problem with the five year land supply. We were on a journey where we could never ever fulfil a five year housing land supply because we are not in control of building the houses. It is volume house builders who will need to deliver much of those numbers and there is the problem.

We have been telling you this for five years now, repeated White Paper motions down in this Council Chamber year in, year out, month in, month out almost, and what do we get in reply? Nothing. Nothing back. Well, the latest from Councillor Lewis is well, we will start a process, and his commentary in the White Paper refers to some of it. The simple question is, when? When are we going to have the result of that process? When is the paper going to be at Executive Board? When are we going to have a reduced housing target figure?

COUNCILLOR R LEWIS: 22nd November.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: I do not blame many Members opposite, this is a complicated issue, a complicated area and indeed for our group as well. Land banking is not simple. Volume house builders will say they do not land bank anything and the reason they can say that is the definition of land banking is when full planning permission is obtained on a site and they do not bring those permissions forward, they do not actually put in for those permissions until they are actually ready to build. They cannot be accused of land banking, they would say. They would say that, wouldn't they?

Councillor Caroline Gruen is completely, totally and utterly wrong in much of what she said, I am afraid.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Written by Peter.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Again, you really need to get a grip of this complicated area. It is not a case of there is no guidance. (*interruption*) Again, I am

sorry but you do not understand the issue. There is guidance. There is guidance. We have been supposedly following the guidance. The bit where we went wrong was that your administration chose the wrong number. You chose the wrong number in a range. You could have chosen 55,000 houses, you chose 70,000 houses. It was wrong, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Andrew Carter.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I directed my comments directly at Richard Lewis in the meeting we attended the Monday before last. I invited him to submit an amendment that we could agree on. If he had been unhappy about the wording about the NPPF I would gladly have altered it, I am not at the stage of my political career – not that I ever was bothered about criticising my own Government or anybody else’s for that matter if I do not agree with them. He did not take me up on that because you lot decided – that is a bit unfair to most of you, somebody decided that no, you have to make this highly political in the hope that you can get off the hook. You will not get off the hook, you are well and truly on the hook because the 70,000 houses is the Alpha and Omega. It is the beginning and the end of the issue. If you had not gone for 70,000 we would not be in this state. It is no good saying somebody said well the builders went for 90,000, we could have ended up with more if we had gone for less. You do not know, you never did it. Everybody else told you to but oh no, as ever, pig headed, arrogant, we know best. I include the officers in that, by the way – sorry, boys, time to man up, it is criticism of everybody.

What you went for was the easy option. It was the Labour Government’s housing figures were easy for you to go with again and it ended you in trouble – big, big trouble.

We were all there at the enquiry, virtually everybody I can see sitting here attended. I look at you lot – how many of you lot attended the Core Strategy?

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: One, just one.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Councillor Peter Gruen, and what did he do? He stood up and gave us a bit of a Blake-esque 20 minute peroration and cleared off, that is what he did, never to be seen again. The Bradford Core Strategy, this group, we put a submission in to the Bradford Core Strategy.

COUNCILLOR J LEWIS: Can we have a repeat? *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: I will tell you why we did. You may laugh, Councillor Lewis, you will not be laughing long! The Bradford Core Strategy affects Morley, Otley and Wharfedale, Horsforth, Guiseley and Rawdon, Calverley and Farsley and Pudsey. Not a dicky bird from any of you lot. Some of us actually went to the inquiry and spoke at the inquiry. He says oh, there was cross city working between the two Authorities. I would like to know what it was. I think it was roll over and tickle my tummy time as far as Leeds was concerned, not surprisingly.

My Lord Mayor, on an extremely serious note, we wanted to try and have all party agreement on this. I just say to Councillor Blake, cross party working, which she is constantly saying is the Leeds way, and indeed it has been, is a two-way street. It is not a one-way street and it is not a cul-de-sac. I am afraid what you have done

today is wholly unacceptable. You had the opportunity to take this forward on an all party basis and very happy to criticise the NPPF, to criticise the Planning Minister past and present but the starting and ending point is that 70,000.

You may smirk, Richard, and say we have started now like he means a week last Monday. They did not start 18 months ago when this fellow told us they were doing, because he had gone then and you did nothing. That is where the buck stops, right over there. I move the motion, my Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Right, we will move to the vote on the amendment. Recorded vote.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: The result, those present 94, those for 34, those against 60. LOST

Now the second amendment in the name of Councillor Campbell.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Same again, present 94, those for 34, against 60. No abstentions. LOST

The third amendment in the name of Councillor Barry Anderson, recorded vote.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Same again, those present 94, those in favour 34, those against 60. LOST

The fourth amendment in the name of Councillor Richard Lewis.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: 94 present, 60 for, 29 against, 5 abstentions. CARRIED

We are now going for the substantive motion. All those in favour. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

ITEM 14 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – GRAMMAR SCHOOLS

THE LORD MAYOR: White Paper Motion 14, Grammar Schools. Councillor Mulherin.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It has been an interesting year for education policy with schools threatened with forced academisation proposals that parents would no longer be supported to be governors on those academies, continuing reductions to the grants that enable Local Authorities to provide a School Improvement Service. The Tory Government seems unable to make

its mind up about what education policy in this country should look like, the policy formed and re-formed on the hoof to suit personalities rather than focusing on what will make better outcomes for children and young people.

I spoke at the last Council meeting about the Government's drive to fragment our education system. There is some considerable irony in Councillor Lamb's amendment today with its talk of ideology when their Government's education agenda seems to be driven by only one thing – a desire to divide: to divide schools from Local Authorities, to divide the haves from the have nots.

When Theresa May spoke of her desire to tackle burning injustice and take on the privileged few, surely she could not have thought that segregating children at the age of eleven on their performance in a narrow test would help her to achieve that aim.

As we know on this side of the Chamber and, I would suggest Members of some of the smaller parties represented in this room do too, the problem we face as a society is that children's life chances are unequal. We have huge inequalities in the UK that are mirrored here in Leeds. We on the Labour benches believe that we should be putting measures in place to tackle that inequality, not introducing selective education policies that will further widen that divide.

A growing body of research has shown that the attainment gap starts pre-school. The evidence is that by the time children start nursery the educational gap between the haves and have nots already exists, and whilst excellent primary education may help to narrow that gap, it is almost impossible if you wait until children start school to actually close it.

That is why we have maintained our commitment to Children's Centres with a focus on high quality early education and support for families to help to overcome the hurdles that so many of our children and families face; hurdles that include poverty, poor parental mental health which has increased significantly as a result of years of austerity, and poor parental educational outcomes. Families want the best for their children in the first three years of life; in particular, we have the perfect opportunity to engage them in setting the foundations that will enable their children to fulfil their potential.

We have maintained that commitment to the Best Start Agenda in Leeds, despite it being increasingly difficult for us to do so as wave after wave of Government funding cuts has hit interventions that we know work, which make a real difference in tackling burning injustice.

The argument that grammar schools provide opportunity for all and that they promote social mobility just does not stack up. Parents with the income to do so in areas where grammar schools already exist pay thousands of pounds to tutor their children privately to prepare them for the entrance exam. Additionally, records show that around 13% of grammar school pupils nationally have previously attended a private prep school. That is more than four times the number of pupils who attend these schools who are eligible for free school meals.

Sir Michael Wilshaw, the outgoing Chief Inspector of Schools, has repeatedly voiced his opposition to grammar schools, at first describing the idea as "tosh and

nonsense.” Sir Michael has now gone on to describe the UK education system as “mediocre but getting better.” He believes that we would score 6.5 out of 10 compared to other countries but that the expansion of grammar school education would set us even further back.

So, what has happened to the focus on closing the gap? By focusing on the narrow group of pupils who pass the 11-plus, those who fail that exam will be left further and further behind. The Institute for Fiscal Studies Analysis has found that attending a grammar school is good for attainment and later earnings for those who do get in but that those pupils who do not pass the exam do worse than pupils who live in areas where there is no selective education. Fewer than half of grammar schools in England prioritise children who are eligible for free school meals and this varies greatly between those schools, with the King Edward VI Foundation in Birmingham doing the most, allocating up to one in four places to those who are eligible for Pupil Premium funding, whereas Urmston Grammar School in Manchester sets aside just three places out of an intake of 150 pupils.

What we need is serious investment from this Government into an education that benefits all our children and not just the privileged few. Now that the Education Bill has been scrapped it is time for the cuts to school services to be reversed. The education system is in flux and Local Authorities are the only constant that schools can turn to. We want there to be support for them and we want to provide that support for them. We are doing that still now in contrast to many other Local Authorities up and down the country who have stopped their School Improvement Services...

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: I am about to sum up. We are happy to be there but we need Government funding to do that.

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: It is clear that the Government’s proposals to expand grammar school education is a worthless distraction...

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: ...and we need to invest in education for all. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Jane Dowson.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I am delighted to second this White Paper as I believe we are faced with a Government that has no clue when it comes to education. What we see is the Government’s education policy in complete and utter disarray. In the Queen’s Speech in March it was announced that all schools would be expected to convert to academies by 2020. This was greeted with uproar from the education sector, open rebellion from Conservative Back Benchers who were opposed to the forced conversion and no doubt a raised eyebrow from Her Majesty herself.

In May the then Education Secretary, Nicky Morgan, was forced into a humiliating U-turn which saw her row back on a policy that had led to strikes across the country and widespread criticism from parents, teachers and unions alike. The language she used then moved to encouraging schools to change to academy status, still keeping the forced conversion of under-performing schools. The forced conversion of schools to academies is something that we on this side of the Chamber have always vehemently opposed.

In October the latest shock announcement from Westminster, the Education for All Bill, was thrown out in its entirety by the new Secretary of State, Justine Greening. They say that week is a long time in politics – I am sure Hillary Clinton probably feels that at the moment – but when it comes to Education Policy eight months is enough to see U-turn after U-turn after U-turn. It is certainly long enough to almost completely erase any memory (my memory is long) of the Voldemort of education policy Michael Gove and his much loathed reforms.

Here we are, not so much back to the future but forward to the past – grammar schools – a system that is socially divisive and labelled some children as failures from the age of eleven. Once again we have Government policy that does not have the full backing of its own party. Prominent figures, including Nicky Morgan, Ken Clarke, Anna Soubry and one David Cameron are leading the way in the open rebellion Theresa May is now facing on this issue.

Our children, families and teachers deserve better than another eight months of uncertainty and chaos. What faith can people have in a Government that has no faith in its own education policies? Lord Mayor, I fully support Councillor Mulherin's call for proper investment in education, investment that will benefit all children and for an education policy that actually works for all children. Thank you. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Alan Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Before I start I would just like to point out that Her Majesty the Queen has done a marvellous job of keeping out of politics and keeping her opinions to herself and I think it was remiss of you to bring her up in this debate, Councillor Dowson. *(interruption)*

Lord Mayor, I was slightly puzzled as to why this White Paper was brought at this time and I was wracking my brains. All the Government has done is introduce a Green Paper for consultation and Councillor Mulherin could have responded to that consultation, the Labour Group could have responded to that consultation, anyone can respond to that consultation. There is no need to bring a White Paper. Personally I would have much rather talked about the food issue that was raised at the start and the deputation, which I actually think has a much bigger impact on educational outcomes.

My conclusion was why have they brought this and I suddenly realised it is probably one of the few issues remaining where all the different factions of the Labour Group can just about agree on something, so it is probably all they were left with.

To be perfectly honest I do not stand here as a fanatical support of grammar schools. I am not leading the clamour for grammar schools to return to Leeds and not all of my colleagues will be comfortable with me saying that. I am quite relaxed

about grammar schools. Where they exist they generally do a pretty good job of educating people and deliver very good outcomes and particularly as Knowsley Council, run by Labour, have put forward in the research they have done, they are particularly helpful in areas of high deprivation and they have particularly good outcomes.

What I am interested in is good schools for children. I do not care whether they are grammar schools or academies or free schools or run by the Local Authority or by faith groups – I do not care. I want good schools for all our children and there are not enough of them, it is as simple as that. There are too many parts of the country, too many parts of our city where children are left behind and while the evidence is mixed on the impact of grammar schools on areas of deprivation and the outcomes are mixed, there is no doubt that when this Council was left exclusively to run education under that administration, they did not do a very good job and they did not get very good outcomes for children and young people and their own Secretary of State had to come and take responsibility for it away from them.

Lord Mayor, I could not possibly support the paper as put down. As I have put on my amendment, what we need is a mixed economy of schools. What we should recognise, if we want the best outcomes for children the starting point is that every child is different and they have different needs and requirements. I went to a comprehensive school, the local comprehensive. I was perfectly happy, that was the right thing for me. My sister went to a grammar school. We were not from a rich background, she had to rely on the assisted places scheme which the Labour Government, it was one of their first acts was to remove the opportunity, and it is particularly hypocritical of Labour politicians, given how so many of them, including Members of this Chamber, like to send their children to fee paying or selective schools but then they want to deny that very same opportunity to the people who elect them to go there. That is a disgrace, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR: Name them.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Hopefully they will have the courage to put their hands up themselves and tell us who they are, but they know who they are, Lord Mayor.

COUNCILLOR HESELWOOD: Mine go to State schools, thank you.

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Mine are at State schools.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: In moving the amendment I hope this is something that all Members can support. I am simply saying we should look to a mixed economy of schools in this city, we should have something for everyone. The UTC, which this administration is very happy to support, is a form of selection. Where is the difference? All that is being proposed is a relaxation of the rules. It is simply a Green Paper and a consultation. This White Paper is completely premature, it is a shame we were not talking about something more important that might actually have an impact on outcomes for children, but there we go. I hope you will support the amendment. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dan Cohen.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Helen Hayden.

COUNCILLOR HAYDEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillor Dowson has already very eloquently made reference to the complete shambles that is this current education policy and I would like to expand on that by outlining what this mixed economy and the mixed message has and the impact it has on Local Authorities.

The Government has already announced £600m of school services cuts for Local Authorities next year. With the role of School Improvement shifting from Local Authorities to Regional Schools Commissioners as all under-performing schools will be forced to become academies and all other schools encouraged to do so, the role of the Local Authorities in education is hugely diminished.

This has now completely changed with the sudden U-turn on academy conversions and it is unclear what role the Local Authorities will now play, but they still have school improvement responsibilities with a large number of mainly primary schools to oversee, but no money to do so. Local Authorities need the Government to reinstate education funding and let them provide stability, which Councillor Mulherin talked about, in a constantly changing education landscape.

Now, I am going to do something which does not sit naturally with me. I am going to quote some prominent Conservatives and I apologise, Councillor Golton, I am using a piece of paper (*laughter*) because I did not write these and I do not want to misquote:

“Conservative Council Leaders including Martin Tett [and I hope I have pronounced that right] from Buckinghamshire County Council have condemned the Government for failing to co-ordinate funding and support saying that Local Authorities have been left with all the responsibility but massive cuts to funding.

Even when schools convert to academy status many of them still rely on the Local Authority for services. Research by the mainly Conservative County Councils’ Network has shown that more than two-thirds of academies choose to purchase School Improvement Services from their Local Authority. Paul Carter, Conservative Leader of Kent County Council, has said his Authority will be losing £4.5m next year and believes the Government should restore funding to enable Councils to continue to support schools.”

Now, Local Authorities work hard to improve standards in schools and Councillor Smart will be covering more on this later. What concerns me is that instead of investing in all schools, which you are quite right, Councillor Lamb, I would want every school to be a good school, to improve standards and therefore outcomes for children, the Government are instead focusing on bringing in policies that will drag this country back decades and increase massively the gap between disadvantaged children and their more advantaged peers. That simply cannot be right

and we all have a duty to demand from Government the investment that is needed to ensure every child in this country receives a world class education.

Separating and labelling children at eleven is not a step forward, it is not the sign of a progressive system; it is a sign of a Government simply looking out for their own and we cannot allow that to happen. Thank you. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Alice Smart.

COUNCILLOR SMART: Lord Mayor, I am very happy to be speaking in support of this White Paper. I completely agree with everything that Councillor Mulherin has said about grammar schools widening the divide between children from disadvantaged backgrounds and those from more advantaged ones. I think it is disgraceful that this Government is proposing to categorise children from the age of eleven by way of a test that is so easily abused by those with the financial means to do so.

I also have a fundamental disagreement with the point of view put forward by this Government that selective schools are best placed to support under-performing schools. We have already heard how grammar schools are over-representative of advantaged pupils from families with the skills and educational background to support them. Will these grammar schools really be able to improve schools with a greater mix of disadvantage, lower achieving pupils and the associated problems of child poverty? I do not believe they will but luckily I know who does have a proven track record when it comes to school improvement.

Recent data gathered by the Local Government Association has shown that Local Authorities have more success in raising school standards than academies or free schools. The LGA says that almost nine out of ten Council run primary and secondary schools are rated as good or outstanding, which is a higher number than among academies and free schools.

Richard Watts, the Chair of the LGA's Children and Young People's Board, has said that Local Authorities have continued to prove their effectiveness in raising school standards, using their relationship with schools and their in-depth knowledge of their local communities. He has gone on to question the ability of unaccountable Regional School Commissioners to turn around under-performing schools across large geographic areas that they know very little about. I suspect we would also be more successful than grammar schools and I would question their ability to turn around schools with a pupil make-up of which they have no experience and have demonstrated very little desire to gain any experience with.

Social segregation is not the answer to educational improvement. The answer is real investment and real support through Local Authorities who know their schools, know their areas and have the experience of delivering the best possible outcomes for pupils and teachers. Thank you, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor David Blackburn.

COUNCILLOR D BLACKBURN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It seems strange that we are discussing grammar schools in the 21st Century. All the places that are held up as having better education systems for us are non-selective. Our education

system, while far from being perfect, is derived from a system that failed my generation with grammar schools and secondary modern schools.

Going back 30, 40 years is not an answer, is it? What we need is a proper education system for all our children that is properly funded and helps them with their abilities and not selecting cream off the top. It never worked, it never will work and it does not work in other countries. It is just strange that we seem to be always looking backwards here instead of looking forwards at ways of succeeding.

We will be supporting the Labour motion. Thank you. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ryan Stephenson.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have to say I heartily agree with Councillor Lamb's statement at the beginning. I think the Executive Member has made somewhat of a premature declaration on this issue.

It is a consultation. It is a Green Paper by Government. There is no official Government policy on it. Indeed, if the Executive Member took time to read the actual consultation, it does explicitly say that the consultation sets out the Government's ambitions to create an education system that extends opportunity to everyone and not just the privileged few.

If you look at that objectively you would imagine that at some point a policy is therefore going to come forward from the Government which sets out a vision for developing and expanding education policy focused around everyone and not just the privileged few. It asks for comments from the public on the idea of creating four areas of new education policy: that the independent schools directly assist the State funded sector – I am sure Members opposite will support that motion; universities playing a direct role in improving school quality – cannot see anything wrong in that; providing more school places and ensuring that they are open to children from all backgrounds; and faith schools delivering more school places while meeting and strengthening safeguards on inclusivity. I honestly cannot see why Members opposite would object to the principles of that consultation.

It leads me to wonder, Members opposite did not want to come forward and admit that any of them went to a grammar school – I will give them another opportunity if there are any in here – but some people did go to grammar schools, including your glorious Leader. Jeremy Corbyn went to a grammar school. Diane Abbott went to a grammar school. It is another case of the liberal elite coming forward and telling everybody else that you are not allowed the privilege that you were allowed when you were a child.

I have got to wonder whether you have actually spoken to any parents about this issue. You stand on street corners with your placards about education not segregation; have you actually asked any parents whether they support the issue?

COUNCILLOR DOWSON: Yes.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: I think if you look at the polling it would suggest that actually people do support it because they want the best for their children, (*interruption*) they want the best opportunities for their children and they want choice

for the schools that their children go to, so beyond the hypocrisy of the Labour Party talking down grammar schools that they attended, they do not want people across the country to have the same opportunities.

COUNCILLOR HESELWOOD: I did not attend a grammar school.

COUNCILLOR: We want the best for all children.

COUNCILLOR STEPHENSON: It leads to the problem we have got today. As outlined by the Prime Minister there is already selection in the school system. In the Council ward that I am privileged enough to represent with my colleagues here, about 50% of people have to attend schools outside the Leeds City Council area because the schools are not good enough within it. That is fine if you live in the Harewood ward and you can afford to do it but the Executive Member earlier on referred to a comparison between Harewood and Hunslet – what of the children in Hunslet whose parents cannot afford to take them to schools outside? We need better schools on the doorsteps for people and to outline straightaway your objection to the principle of new schools and more school places means that you have walked yourselves down into a cul-de-sac that when the Government comes forward and suggests an idea, for example it might be virtual grammar schools, it might be that we have a grammar school system within existing schools, more setting, more streaming, you have already set out that you are opposed to that for the people that you represent in your areas.

What we need is a sensible conversation on improving life chances for people of all backgrounds, regardless of their wealth, and that is what this consultation sets out, Lord Mayor. (*applause*)

COUNCILLOR HESELWOOD: What we need is to be able to build schools again.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Matthew Robinson.

COUNCILLOR ROBINSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment and that is not because I went to a grammar school – I went to a comprehensive primary school in Leeds, I went with Councillor Coupar's children to the same comprehensive school, actually. It is not because I believe that grammar schools are the silver bullet to social mobility either, but it is because of the mixed economy in schools that I think must exist because sometimes not a one size fits all model is right for every child. We do not do it with special schools, we do not do it with UTC, we do not do it with private schools, we do not ban those – in fact they have got charitable status and they are positively encouraged to work with State schools. We do it with a vast array of schools, actually.

I would like to take us from the City of Leeds to the City of Joe Chamberlain down in Birmingham because the King Edward VI Foundation has been mentioned already and I have the great pleasure to know the Chief Exec of the King Edward VI Foundation because he was my former boss. Before I start I must say that he has already tweeted me today knowing that I would be speaking on this to invite all Members of this Chamber to go down to Birmingham and see schools in the King Edward VI Trust down there and I will be writing to all Members with that offer tomorrow to pass on the details because I think it is a school that you should go visit.

The reason that I think that is a school you should visit is because they make sure that 20-25% of their places in school will go to free school meals students, will go to kids who are coming from lower income backgrounds. They make sure that they are not competing against the children who are coming from higher income backgrounds, actually they reserve those places. It is not hiving off the top, it is not the three places that you mentioned in Manchester. It is actually a very positive intervention in some of the most challenging communities in Birmingham.

They actually look to make sure that they are leading standards by sponsoring other schools in the area as well by forming a multi-academy trust to not just be a grammar school but to work with other State schools. They actually go and do outreach programmes into other primary schools, knowing that some of those students will not go to their school eventually but actually will go to other schools in the Birmingham area. Their attitude is that on a high tide all the ships rise.

This is why I struggle to understand when there is a consultation document out and that nobody here is saying that they are in favour of the 11-plus or going back to a secondary modern, but that you predetermine your position on a consultation before you know any of the details. I am really struggling to understand why that approach would be taken.

As has already been mentioned, parents can buy homes to move near to other good State schools using their wealth to do that but we are not talking about that issue. In fact, if you were coming forward with a policy discussion, if it was actually a policy of Leeds City Council to look at a lottery system for children across the city, I would be more than happy to have that discussion. Actually that is a fair system that will make sure that all children can go to different schools across the city.

I would also mention schools such as the Dixon's Academy Trust and the Gorse Academy Trust who are doing fantastic things in this city. I know that the parents in Farnley and in Morley who get to send their children to Morley Academy and Farnley Academy are very, very pleased with the results. Progress 8 measures in their school are some of the highest in this city. In fact, Farnley is first and Morley is third in the Progress 8 results. They are outstripping results of other schools but this has not been mentioned in this White Paper today. We have not talked about Teach First and getting more good students from universities into the classroom. We have not actually talked about dealing with setting and streaming and what goes on in school. We are not talking about the issues. We are talking about a consultation that does not have any weight at the moment and is just a talking shop piece. Quite frankly, it beggars belief.

Lord Mayor, if the administration opposite want to come back with a proper education White Paper to discuss what education looks like across this city I am more than happy to have that debate and that discussion. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Dan Cohen.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I must confess like my colleagues I find today's White Paper really quite frustrating because if there is one area that I would like to think that we would all agree that we should not be continually spouting outdated dogma it must surely be in relation to education.

COUNCILLOR: Free schools.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: Surely, if we can agree on one thing – it is full this year, you will be pleased to know – it is that we must always, always act in the best interests of the children of our city and that we should not be seeking to drive down standards to the lowest common denominator. We should be striving to improve children's outcomes, striving to ensure that no child ever gets left behind. We should be seeking to eradicate that gap that we see in attainment for vulnerable groups of children. We should be ensuring, like I spend a great deal of my time trying to ensure, that every child is given the absolute best possible opportunity to succeed in their education, to excel in their education.

The suggestion that one size fits all as an approach to education has been shown time and again to be fallacious and it is highly frustrating that the Labour Group's default position seems to be that anything that is a move away from community comprehensives and a Local Authority control must be automatically bad.

The fact is there are some great and there are some not so great examples of different models of all different types of schools, of all different types of settings. There is no question – there is no question – that becoming an academy helped Hillcrest Primary School where Councillor Gruen is the Chair of Governors, that it helped that school get “outstanding” in every single Ofsted criteria. That is a tremendous movement from when it was last judged. *(applause)*

There is no question that free schools will be a key contributor to school places and academic excellence and places such as Roundhay will be beneficiaries of this as soon as we are able to find them – sorry, as soon as you are able to find them – a site to help in the school places. There is no question that great local comprehensives schools like Allerton High School in my ward, where I am a Governor, who had some of the most amazing GCSE results this year, who were delivering amazing pupil progress data, that they too have a major part, a real part in driving up standards in education across the city. There is no question that the city's church and other faith schools play an important part in offering parents the ability to choose an educational setting that fits in with their own faith and background.

There is no question that in time grammar schools in the right place, like Councillor Stephenson said, like the one Mr Corbyn attended or the one John McDonnell attended, or the one Diane Abbott attended, or Jon Trickett – shall I go on? Grahame Morris. There is no question that grammar schools can be a positive addition to that mix in the right place. Dogmatic condemnation is, however, hugely unhelpful and entirely unbecoming. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Ryk Downes.

COUNCILLOR DOWNES: Thank you, Lord Mayor. So where do I stand on this? I looked at the Labour White Paper and I have to say I agree with the comments in it and where do we as a party stand? Well, Tim Farron has come out against selective education on several occasions and has vowed to fight the policy with Labour on this one. *(hear, hear)* Thank you! He stated he is utterly opposed to any plan that will bring back grammar schools and has written an appeal to Conservative MPs to defy the Government on this issue.

If I can take up on my own personal example. I went to a comprehensive school and I moved schools at the time when the assessment was being done as to whether I could go to a grammar school and I did not understand much about it other than the fact that I had only just moved so they said well, you have just made some new friends, you stay at this school, so I did not go to the grammar school.

I have always felt that the education that I received in the comprehensive system was a second tier type of education. I did CSEs – people I knew did O-levels and did A-levels, I did not. It held me back; it held me back when I wanted to get a job. I could not do the job I wanted to do. When I was younger I wanted to become a teacher. I did not have the A-levels to become a teacher. Some of you may have known that recently I actually started to attend Trinity University to retrain as a teacher. Sadly because of what happened to me earlier this year I have not been able to continue that course for certain health reasons, but it taught me one or two things about teaching.

I actually went into schools to teach and I found that the classes I was teaching had pupils that were at the top end and pupils at the bottom end and I taught them all together. Actually one of the things they taught me at university was that there are different types of teaching, and one is called social constructivism by Lev Vygotsky. What that does is it helps children learn from each other. They learn collectively and as such - and this actually happened to me when I was at comprehensive school. I was very good at maths and the rest of the class were actually coming to me to help them because they could understand me talking to them as opposed to a teacher talking to them so I was actually teaching some of the lower ones within my class in the comprehensive school but when I went to try and go further I could not go further, and that to me is the failing of the grammar school because you have got the two tier of education.

If I can just come on to the Sutton Trust report in 2013 and, I am sorry, Stewart, I am going to crib this so that I do not actually get it wrong. Less than 3% of entrants to grammar schools are entitled to free school meals, whereas almost 20% of entrants to non-selective schools are entitled to free school meals. Grammar schools take just over double the national average of children who attended fee-paying preparatory schools. In Local Authorities that operate the grammar system, children who are not eligible for free school meals have a much greater chance of attending a grammar school than similarly high achieving children who are eligible for school meals. For example, in selective Local Authorities 66% of children who achieve level 5 in both English and Maths at Key Stage 2 who are not eligible for free school meals go to a grammar school compared with 40% of similarly high achieving children who are not eligible for free school meals. Pupils are less likely to attend a grammar school if they attend primary schools with a high proportion of pupils from deprived backgrounds.

We see in Leeds many areas of deprivation and there are areas of deprivation within my own ward, and that actually will affect all children in Leeds. That is why I think the two tier education system such as a grammar school provides is the wrong way forward. Put children together, they can learn together, you can still get high achievers getting really good grades within that system. It is down to how we actually teach them, not where we teach them. Thank you. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stewart Golton.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thanks, Lord Mayor. I am sorry if I am coming across as a bit of a purist when it comes to you should not read anything. The trouble is it is because I have been frantically scribbling loads of stuff down as I have been listening to this lot. I just cannot understand it.

COUNCILLOR: He needs a grammar school education!

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: The Tories have been in Government for a long time. Since Margaret Thatcher decided to create more comprehensives than any other Education Secretary, this party has been in Government for a significant amount of time, the Labour Party has been in Government for a significant amount of time. The thing about grammar schools is, it is the past and the only reason why you have got this policy right now is because you want to look more like UKIP. *(laughter)* It is true. This is the consequence of Brexit...

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: More like you!

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: ...and it is so sad. It is so sad. We spent so many years getting used to the idea of academies. We have had free schools thrown at us, we have had forced academisation thrown at us but at least they were sort of forward looking and this is very much about going back to the past. It is like when they asked UKIP supporters what do you like most about the UK and they went "The past" and this is what this is all about.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: They did not say the Lib Dems, that's for sure.

COUNCILLOR: That is the past.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Shall I remind you why we got rid of this policy in the first place? It was your party that got rid of this policy. It is because grammar schools are...

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It was Margaret Thatcher that got you into politics.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: ...educational apartheid. That is why they got rid of them because the Tories actually, under a meritocratic system, when they actually promoted leaders that came from the working class or the lower middle classes back in the past, they actually wanted the same for the rest of the population and they knew that grammar schools were actually standing in the way of that and they got rid of them.

Why the hell are you trying to bring them back now? I will tell you why, because the squeezed middle are back. The squeezed middle are back and it is full of aspirational parents who want to send their kids to private school. They want the best outcome for them possible and they see private education and they go, "I want some of that for my kids", but do you know what, they cannot afford it. What is the other way to do it? Well, you try and provide it within the state sector and that is really, really unfair for the rest of society, it really is.

You were pointing over here not so long back and going “How many of you over there went to a grammar school? How many of you? You two-faced people.” *(laughter)* Do you know what? I went to a grammar school. *(cheering and interruption)*

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: We know you did.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: In fact worse, it was a private school.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: It was a private school.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: It was a private school.

COUNCILLOR J PROCTER: Leeds Grammar School.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: It was a private school that had an entrance examination and do you know what, the point of it is, it gave me a really good education and because it gave me a really good education I could think for myself and I could come to the conclusion that just because I had a privileged education does not mean to say...

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Be a Liberal Democrat! *(laughter)*

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: ...that we should actually institutionalise it and try and make sure that some people get better than others.

Ever since I got my decent education I have been trying, through being a Governor at local schools, to get the better education for my community and one of the things that I do know that stands in the way of that better education is more and more interference from ideologues, primarily not just from the Tories, we have had Mr Gove, haven't we, we have had academisation, that was bad enough but for all those good news stories that you are giving us, “Oh, they have done marvellously ever since they have become a free school. Oh, academisation is fantastic” there are plenty of examples in this city of schools that have been academised and are failing. Stop meddling with the system and just put the resources in and we will make sure that we have a good education for our people in this city. *(applause)*

COUNCILLOR ANDREW CARTER: Get on the stage! *(laughter)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Mulherin to sum up.

COUNCILLOR MULHERIN: I would like to thank everybody for their contributions. I think there are some interesting themes emerging from that discussion, not least the view that the Tory proposals are not so much looking to the future, going back to the future, but moving forward to the past and a general feeling certainly on three-quarters of the Council Chamber that these proposals would take us backwards and not improve outcomes for children in our city.

We will not be taking any lessons from the Tories either on party unity, given the considerable disagreements in their ranks about proposals for grammar school education. I would like to thank in particular Councillor Downes and Councillor Blackburn for sharing their personal stories with us and welcome both Lib Dem and

Green Party support for our White Paper. I think the additional information that Councillor Downes provided from the Sutton Trust backed up the information I provided in the reason why I was moving this paper today in my opening speech and the comments that were made by Councillor Smart, Councillor Hayden and Councillor Dowson.

Then for Councillor Stephenson, I think you really need to get a reality check. The whole purpose of this is to actually be very clear. This Council is opposed to expansion of grammar schools. We do not think that is the way forward to actually ensure all of our children in our city get the best possible opportunity to fulfil their potential. We think that your Government policies are actually driving away the opportunities for many of our children to get the best education that they can get and I am glad to see that three-quarters of this Chamber agree with us.

I would just like to say to sum up, let us go to the vote, could we have a recorded vote and I hope that the MBIs will also join us in supporting the White Paper. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Can we have a seconder for that? *(Secinded)*

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Those present 93; those in favour of the motion in the name of Councillor Lamb 19; abstentions 1; against 73. LOST

The substantive motion.

(A recorded vote was taken on the substantive motion)

THE LORD MAYOR: Those present 94; those in favour 75; against 19. No abstentions. CARRIED.

ITEM 15 – WHITE PAPER MOTION – CARE HOMES

THE LORD MAYOR: White Paper 15, Councillor Finnigan.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I formally move this particular resolution. I am happy to accept the amendments from Councillor Buckley and Councillor Golton on this particular one.

There are five reasons that I think you should support this particular White Paper.

The first is that all of the residents of the homes that are affected are some of the most vulnerable residents within our community and certainly if you have the opportunity to look at delivering the Better Life Strategy in Leeds, respond to the Better Life Strategy Update from Scrutiny Board dated July 2016 which has some useful information in it.

Certainly if you were to turn to page 613 or page 9 of that particular document you would see if you look at the number of people and their ages in the different care

homes, you will see that there are two who are 100-plus; you will see that there are 15 who are between 90 and 99 – indeed regrettably that is 14 because one of the people that we have been campaigning for, one of the residents we have been campaigning for in Siegen Manor passed away earlier this week. If you were to look at how many were between 80 and 89 that is 34 people in total, so by the time you have finished (if I went to a grammar school I would add these up quicker) but that is over 50 people who are somewhat vulnerable, the most vulnerable Members within our community and we owe it to them to try and make sure that we give them the peaceful lives that they are actually looking for.

The second point that I would ask colleagues to reflect upon is the financial situation. We know that closing these homes would save £1.945m but we also know that the Social Care Levy generates £5.1m every year, year after year after year which means £10.2 next year which means £15 the year after, £20 the year after and that gives us absolutely every opportunity to pause. That is what we are saying at this particular point. We are not saying do not ever close these particular homes, certainly if you have visited some of them you will know that they have seen better days notwithstanding the care that they receive in those homes is outstanding.

What we do think is that financially because of the situation that we are in, that we can pause for a couple of years while we reflect on what alternatives are available.

The third point I would ask colleagues to reflect upon is the quality of the alternative in the private sector. I attended a Scrutiny Board hearing where I said that you are playing a certain level of Russian roulette in terms of the alternative accommodation that is available and you have a 50/50 chance of getting a home that is good or of getting a home that is a failing home or needs improvement. That is not really acceptable, that is an unacceptable alternative for some of the most vulnerable people within our community.

The fourth point I would ask colleagues to reflect upon is not that these homes are the be all and end all, these are not the peak, these are not the best types of accommodation that we could ever come up with. Indeed, there are better alternative types of accommodation such as extra care housing that we should be looking towards.

Our view is that a two year pause we would be in a situation where we can strive towards providing that alternative accommodation, that alternative extra care accommodation that might be able to accept some of these residents moving collectively together as a community.

The fourth point that we would make is about the care market. At this particular point you are removing the Local Authority from providing care, you are in a situation where you are pretty much leaving the care market to the private sector and that cannot be healthy for any market. It is unhealthy for any market to dominate in one way or another when it has not appropriate competition.

So what we are asking for is a pause. We are not saying please leave it open for ever and ever and ever. This would cost you somewhere in the region of less than £4m. We have offered £4m to Headingley Cricket Club to bring test cricket or to continue test cricket at this particular point. It is a tough time, we have to make tough

decisions. I think those decisions need to be about protecting the most vulnerable in our communities.

I formally move the White Paper.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Shirley Varley.

COUNCILLOR VARLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I would like to second this proposal and reserve the right to speak. Thank you.

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Neil Buckley.

COUNCILLOR BUCKLEY: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Just for the avoidance of doubt, I went to a Local Authority grammar school and it was so good that they have now turned it into a block of flats! *(laughter)*

Lord Mayor, in moving our amendment the first question surely, this is the key question, if we take the Whips and the coercion and all the threats out of the equation, is there a majority in this Chamber in favour of the immediate closure of these care homes and day centre facilities. I think the answer to that question is no. I am going to come back to that in a moment or two.

We have had a little bit of sound and fury and call ins and reference backs but let us just remind ourselves for a brief moment about the kind of things that a great city like Leeds should aspire to and should have. It should have great enterprises and great businesses; a superb retail sector; modern, successful schools, great architecture; and a modern, efficient transport system, for example.

Well, we have got some of those things but the mark of a great city is the protection and the help it offers to its elderly and its vulnerable and Leeds has a proud tradition of doing just that. This is just such an opportunity for the city to do the right thing again.

This amendment we believe adds a further safeguard to the Morley Borough Councillor Finnigan's motion by adding "until acceptable alternative provision is available."

Their motion and our amendment does not say there should be no change ever at all under any circumstances but merely a pause for two years. The Scrutiny Board originally recommended that The Green, for example, be retained for two years and also subsequently made the proviso that there should be a seamless transition to a possible NHS extra care bed solution.

Councillor Blake mentioned this earlier on. This has not to my knowledge yet been confirmed. It is possible but it has not been confirmed. They also recommended that any alternative provision should be at least of equal quality and that work be carried out into ways of improving the ratings of the independent sector and that surely is a point also made by Councillor Gruen. It is the key point to get these standards improved.

Lord Mayor, there are several uncertainties in the market at the moment, as Councillor Finnigan referred to. We have got the shortage of nurses in nursing

homes; the possible withdrawal from the market or the failure of some care home providers; possible changes in the present over supply of care beds in Leeds; the effect of the living wage on care homes and day centre staffing costs; even unknowns like the availability of Eastern European staff in the next two or three years. We just do not know. We are also asked to accept that the NHS might provide funding for immediate beds at The Green but it might not, as I have previously said.

Lord Mayor, in conclusion, this all amounts to a lot of uncertainty. We believe there is enough doubt about all these changes to justify a pause, certainly for two years and certainly until acceptable alternative provision is secured. Just to come back to my original question, Lord Mayor, without Whipping and coercion and threats, is there actually a majority in this Chamber to support these immediate closures? I believe not and I move this amendment. (*applause*)

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Caroline Anderson to second.

COUNCILLOR C ANDERSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I speak in favour of Councillor Buckley's amendment. As the amendment states, "or until a suitable alternative has been found", these are the operative words. We need to be prepared because this could take some time. They need to be the right alternatives. In the meantime we need to stop creating a self-fulfilling prophecy. There are places in these care homes because, as Councillor Lamb has pointed out in the reference back, these homes are no longer taking new residents. We need to actively market these care homes if we are successful in keeping them open. This will then generate revenue.

The Labour Party in this Chamber are split on this. At the Scrutiny call-in meeting the report states that the decision to refer back was not supported unanimously, four Labour Councillors voting to release the decision as it stood and two Labour Councillors and all Opposition Councillors voting to refer back.

I am all in favour of the Better Life Strategy but it is not about keeping everyone out of care homes. It is about keeping those who can live with support in their own homes in their own homes, but for those with serious disabilities or dementia, that there is a place for them that can provide appropriate and sustained care. It is about choice.

The number of people who will be 85 or over will more than double from 1.4 million to 3.5 million between 2010 and 2035. Some of these people will be in Leeds and some of these people will need places in care homes. If we continue to close care homes we will end up with hospitals and the NHS taking up the slack and the cost of this would run to £3bn annually notwithstanding the impact on other patients.

This reminds me of the time Leeds decided we did not need all the primary school places that we had and quite a number of primary schools were closed. We need those places now and we are scrambling about to find suitable places for children who need them. Again, this draws parallels with the care homes because the places have to be good and they have to be in the right place.

Current occupancy of Council run care homes is about 65%. There are some very good care homes in Leeds that are Council run, often much better than the private providers. We need to change people's perceptions. The relatives of those in

our threatened care homes have been excellent advocates for these homes and I would like to thank them for their input and their hard work on this issue. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Stewart Golton to move a second amendment.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. In moving the second amendment it is primarily about extra detail. We have included in our amendment the care homes which were in the first round of proposed closures through this strategy. They are still open at the moment and that is in no small part due to the campaigning of local residents, but the overwhelming principle through which they were left open was the fact that we recognised as a Council that the wellbeing of those residents depended upon their community setting; it depended upon them having regular access from their friends and relatives and, of course, being within the same community meant that that was eased. The alternatives which were offered at the time were anything up to seven miles away, which meant that those people and their families would be increasingly isolated from one another.

The solution for Rothwell was that we would encourage a social enterprise to create an alternative, a new build which would enable the two homes in the Rothwell area to close in the knowledge that better accommodation would be found. The Council has reneged on that promise specifying that the private sector has now filled that gap. That is one of the reasons why we wanted to support this motion in the first place because I just wanted to point out that when the Council thinks (and they have accused this lot of being ideological) ideologically that the private sector will provide, they need to be careful about what that kind of private sector provision will be.

There has been a lot of talk about low quality private sector accommodation; I would say there is just as big a risk in having very good high quality private sector accommodation because as the profit margin is squeezed out of the sector, what we are finding is that a lot of operators are actually choosing to specialise in luxury accommodation and the alternative accommodation which the people of Rothwell are supposed to be enjoying as an alternative to their very well appreciated Council run accommodation is one which advertises itself as five star luxury accommodation for the discerning client.

I am sure you can agree, we want five star luxury accommodation for all of our people but in the current funding regime that is not going to happen. Even if the Council makes an agreement with such providers that they will create for them an accommodation for the funded clients that the Council is responsible for, that will still mean that there are very significant numbers who are self funders but on limited incomes that are not being catered for whatsoever.

That is one of the reasons why we cannot withdraw from the provision and the portfolio of properties that we have as a Council because we have yet to find a proper alternative for those people who are in the middle and could be squeezed out of being housed in their community altogether.

As I pointed out earlier on, there are pressures already in terms of how we might also provide enough care workers for our home care alternative that we are depending on, because people are supposed to be not going to residential homes, they

are supposed to be staying in their own home. How do we know we are going to have enough carers for those? Also, the extra care housing that we are hoping to develop in the city, nobody is coming forward to fulfil those places that have already got planning permission for this to happen and the Council is now having to go to Plan B and provision itself without a predicated budget for this to happen.

We need these homes to be kept until Plan B has been found. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Campbell.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Lord Mayor I think I touched at the beginning of the afternoon on the basic issue which is that as a nation we are unwilling, if that is the right word, to invest properly in providing care for older people. Traditionally the City Council has picked up the slack, in many ways, and has done a very good job, let's be honest about that.

Unfortunately, we seem to have a view now within the City Council to move away from that role as a provider, I suppose, and it relates to the idea that there is acceptable alternative provision. I will touch on Spring Gardens in Otley which was scheduled for closure; after a long battle it was agreed that until a suitable alternative was available then we would not be moving people out of there. It is actually still quite popular, there are lots of people who would like to go in if they could get in as perhaps has been raised earlier on.

The original proposal that we were told might replace Spring Gardens relates to a new build which took a while to get off the ground but has recently been completed and so I will give you a for instance now, picking up on Stewart's point in relation to the provision that has now been afforded or brought forward, should I say, by the private sector in relation to the provision we did. This is a new development in Otley where you actually buy a unit and they come in I was going to say all shapes and sizes – they come in three sizes. You can buy a one bedroom one to which you have to spend the best part of £200,000; you can buy a two bedroom one where you are on about £250,000; a three bedroom one where you are on about £300,000 and I think we have got one four bedroom penthouse one which is eye-wateringly getting on for half a million.

On top of that, of course, there are services provided, food with a restaurant etc. You have to pay an annual charge on a monthly basis for that again of several thousand pounds. Care will be provided if you need it but again that is an extra charge. It is a really good example, in my opinion, of the way the private sector is moving into the expensive end of the market because they can make a lot of money, while the other end of the market is being abandoned by just about everybody. Again, we have already heard, haven't we, that the private sector on I suppose the cheaper end of the market is in crisis because we have got a substantial number of units now which are performing well below standard.

So I am concerned that the Local Authority is abandoning this bit in the middle where we used to provide that service and for very good reasons perhaps we are coming away or trying to come out of that, but what will happen to those people who cannot afford the very expensive provision that is now being built and provided? We really do not want to put in a sub-standard home that we know is prevalent within

the lower end of the market. What is going to happen to them if we come out of that market?

I think it is wrong of us to even think about doing that until, and I have to say it may be a long time...

THE LORD MAYOR: Time.

COUNCILLOR CAMPBELL: ...it may be more than two years before that provision can be brought into play which will provide a reasonable level of accommodation for everybody in this city. (*applause*)

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

COUNCILLOR CHARLWOOD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Yes, I want to move an amendment to the White Paper and I feel like we have been talking about going back to the future – well, we have gone back to earlier in the meeting when we had a very lengthy debate about this particular issue but we have gone even further back than that to before the Scrutiny call in to go back to the two year proposal to keep a stay for two years, if you like, for those three sites.

I think that was very well covered by the seven hour Scrutiny inquiry and just for the benefit of Members earlier, we did accept the recommendations that Scrutiny came to following the call in and they were that The Green is retained until there can be a seamless transition to the new facility; that we will guarantee at least equal quality of care; that we will work on the quality of care in the independent sector, put special focus into improving that; there will be assurances around time scales relating to Siegen Manor; and that they did not make any comment on Middlecross or on the two year, apart from the time scale on Siegen Manor.

I just thought for the benefit of a couple of things that I did not mention earlier and a couple of the points that have been raised. Just to try and give some comfort to Councillor Finnigan with residents being of a certain age and just to say yes, this is very difficult and moving house at that sort of age is obviously unwelcome and something you might not particularly want to do, but we have successfully moved people in Phases 1 and 2 from care homes like the ones we are thinking about now to other sites and places and they have then been chased up, they have been checked in on at a future date and how they are feeling and how they have settled and are they happy and that data has been collected. It shows that there actually is no effect if the move has been done sensitively and not rushed and done in accordance with that person's wishes, that there is no negative effect on that person's health even at an advanced age of that.

Councillor Buckley, you were saying you want to wait until there is good quality independent sector places for people to move to. There are spaces in good quality care homes now and I just wanted to say there is absolutely no immediate closure. There is, in the Better Lives Report and in the appendices, a time line that is an indicative time line. Nobody will be forced to move to somewhere they do not want to go. They will be given support by a very well trained team, it is a very personalised and supportive process for precisely the reasons we have just mentioned,

Councillor Finnigan. I hope that gives you that assurance that those issues have been considered.

Councillor Golton was talking about the private sector provision. I think there has been a lot said about the private sector provision being undesirable. There are some very good private sector provisions and independent sector and also the framework price agreement, people do not seem to have that in their minds either. There is a framework price agreement that we have a contract with the sector with. They cannot charge above that if that person is receiving a personal budget from us so that keeps the prices down.

I would just say while I have a moment that in the STP discussions going on we need to try and get more funding for social care through that partnership working. Just 11% of the £129bn health and care budget is spent by Councils on Adult Social Care and more of that needs to be spent on Adult Social Care to relieve pressure on the NHS. That is what we are trying to do with the intermediate care beds. I just move my amendment. Thank you. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Neil Dawson.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I also have a confession to make that I also went to a grammar school in this city. When I had been there for three years in actual fact it was turned into a comprehensive school by the then Conservative run Council, Councillor Paddy Crotty Chair of the Education Committee under a Conservative Government under Margaret Thatcher. Who better to vote for why I am supporting Councillor Charlwood's motion.

Politics is about making difficult decisions and the decommissioning of a care home impacts on many elderly and vulnerable people and their carers and is one of those difficult decisions. Many people in the Council including myself have an elderly parent who they want to do their best for. Disrupting the lives of vulnerable people is not to be done lightly and it is only after careful consideration, consultation when all the options are exhausted.

We have to balance the impact we have on current residents whilst ensuring we are capable of meeting the needs of those who will need our support in the future. In 2011 it was recognised that doing nothing to change the provision of adult care was not an option; we have to make changes and since then we have made changes including the decommissioning of eight homes and many day centres in Leeds.

Councillor Finnigan raised some of the points about financing. The demand pressures on adult care are increasing by around £15m to £20m per year. There are simply a lot more elderly people. The levy that has become called the Osborne Levy will not simply be enough to meet that gap. In fact, we should also remember the Osborne Levy is paid by the Council taxpayers of Leeds, it is not paid by Central Government. It is paid by everyone in this room and paid by the citizens of Leeds.

The other red herring they threw in was Yorkshire County Cricket Club. The £4m there is not available for this. It is from capital expenditure; we are talking about revenue. If we had the same rules or similar rules on capital applied to revenue then there would be a chance that the Council may be in a better financial position.

COUNCILLOR GOLTON: That's all right then.

COUNCILLOR DAWSON: We also know that the proportion of spend on adult care is rising every year. It is 40.6% this year; in 2011 when I was first elected it was 30%. It is taking up 10% more of the Council's resources. It cannot go on and we have to take a different approach.

The Better Life Strategy is that alternative approach. It is about supporting people to stay in their own homes and creating extra care housing to meet demand. At least £12m has been identified with a further £18m, a combination of right to buy receipts and housing revenue account being potentially earmarked towards a major extra care programme which I believe we would seek Executive approval early next year.

If we do nothing we will incur another £4.2m of costs, then we will still be faced with the same difficult decision about decommissioning these homes. The economics will not change. In politics, as in life, delaying a decision does not help. Putting this into the long grass will not make the decision any easier. We have to recognise that demand for places in our care homes is dropping. Siegen Manor has an occupancy rate of less than 70%. Only seven of the residents in Siegen Manor were previously residents in Morley.

Our remaining care homes are well run and have excellent staff but we do not have the money to invest in them, the existing care homes or new care homes. Only the independent sector can do that. We need to ensure we provide alternatives such as extra care housing and promote good quality private sector provision. In Morley I will work to ensure that happens and we do have good quality provision that will replace Siegen Manor through either the independent sector or with investment in extra care housing. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. Councillor Wilford.

COUNCILLOR WILFORD: Thank you, Lord Mayor. I want to talk on the White Paper three as well. I think are we as a Council confident the quality of care will not diminish if we decommission Middlecross, Siegen Manor and The Green amongst other places?

In comparison to care homes in the private sector, as has already been said, the Local Authority homes provide good care with no improvements required, which is not always the case in the private sector. This information is from the Care Quality Commission assessments.

I feel that in keeping Middlecross, Siegen Manor and The Green for a further two years, it would give residents, staff and carers confidence and meet their needs. We are all aware of the impact that decommissioning will have in terms of moving people from their homes perhaps specifically for people who are living with dementia so for two years I think this would provide the Council time to put in place further assessments to determine if changes will be cost effective and to ensure that what is put in place will be robust and meet the needs of individuals.

We are being driven by cuts from Central Government and a further two years will allow Council to fully explore alternatives to what we have now instead of

rushing what is a delicate process with wider implications for residents, staff, carers and as a legacy for this Council.

In this climate of austerity is it financially viable for the private sector to build and provide care? Can we as a Council guarantee the alternatives to Local Authority care homes will be as good as what we have now? We do not want to create anxiety for those we have a duty as a Council to look after. Thank you, Lord Mayor.
(applause)

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Debra Coupar.

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: Thank you, Lord Mayor. It will be no surprise that I am speaking in support of Councillor Charlwood's amendment here today but the reason I am doing so is, it gives me the opportunity to speak positively about some of the things that we are doing as a Labour administration and a Leeds City Council around extra care housing.

Extra care housing provides self-contained accommodation with care available on site. It allows older people to live independently in their own homes whilst getting the care they need, avoiding the need to move into residential care. There is growing evidence that extra care is favoured by the majority of people as it bridges the gap effectively between home life and residential care and it allows families and couples to stay together, most importantly. People also like to have a greater range of choice, something that has not always been available to them in the past. Extra care housing can also provide a safety net if private or other residential homes fail.

Research by the International Longevity Centre has found that where housing includes access to extra care, over 80s with care needs are less likely to move into institutional homes in the future. The research also found that residents in extra care housing are also less likely to be admitted to hospital for an overnight stay compared to similar demographics in their own community. There are also benefits in terms of mental health. Residents in extra care facilities have enhanced opportunities to interact with neighbours and benefit from communal facilities, offering leisure and meaningful residential led activities, reducing issues of social isolation and loneliness.

The changing aspirations and expectations of people as they get older need to be matched with appropriate and affordable resources. This administration is working extremely hard to make sure this work is under way, and in fact well under way and nearly finished is Wharfedale View extra care scheme in Yeadon. With over 50 one and two bed properties it is about to open and we are looking at all options for further Council development of extra care schemes.

In moving this work forward we will be assessing where extra care would be most needed. We will also be taking into account Council and privately owned nursing and non-nursing care already available and this is part of our efforts to ensure we have a wide range of housing types across all tenures including a range of specialised housing options.

We will also work with private providers to see what they can do to help grow the provision of extra care in Leeds and we will be exploring a range of other options such as working in partnership with housing associations. The fact that we are moving forwards with this shows yet again how forward thinking this Labour

administration actually is. The extra care approach provides greater flexibility and greater efficiency, a factor which is particularly important in the connection of shrinking Council budgets.

Other people should be afforded a better quality of life than is currently possible in some of our older care homes. Leeds is aiming to be the best city to grow old in and to move to more flexible provision of care can only help with this ambition. I support Councillor Charlwood's amendment. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Thank you. Councillor Lamb.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: Thank you, Lord Mayor. This is a very serious issue but I was just chuckling to myself at the last contribution and remembered, I would like to go back to the past, Councillor Golton. I am just imagining what it would be like if these roles were reversed and having remembered the sort of speeches you gave to Councillor Harrand several years ago about these issues it is slightly ironic to hear you supporting the position now.

Lord Mayor, there are just two points I want to make. One, Councillor Finnigan referred to the £1.9m that keeps being referred to as the cost of keeping these homes open. Actually, that is wrong. That is only if things stay exactly as they are. If you start to fill the spaces, if you start to proactively look at how you can use the homes differently, possibly provide intermediate care and do things differently, you can very quickly close that gap and in actual fact many of these homes are perfectly viable in their own right...

COUNCILLOR COUPAR: That is what we are doing.

COUNCILLOR LAMB: ... if you release the freeze on taking people in.

The second point I want to make, Councillor Charlwood, you had three opportunities to address the point that I made earlier. You said again that there is no quick closure here but I pointed out, you have already stopped taking new admissions to The Green in complete contravention to what you have said today, what has been in all the papers and while it is too late for you to respond at this stage, I hope you will email all Councillors tomorrow as a matter of urgency to clarify what the position is and why exactly you have stopped taking admission to The Green and particularly why you are trying to hide it and you have moved the admissions board and hidden it in a cupboard. Perhaps you can clarify that.

I am pleased to support the amendment in the name of Councillor Buckley and I wholeheartedly endorse the comments of the Lib Dems led by Councillor Golton, and Councillor Finnigan. Thank you, Lord Mayor. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Councillor Finnigan to sum up.

COUNCILLOR FINNIGAN: Very briefly, we have had a good discussion and a good debate on this one. We still think that there are alternatives to closure that need to be explored at this particular point. We do note the comments about extra care and certainly we would welcome extra care in the Morley area. We do believe that we do want to strive towards giving those residents who are presently in all of our care homes something better than what they are in at this particular point.

I do accept what Councillor Lamb is saying in terms of the options to pull that £1.9m bill down. Regardless of what Councillor Dawson says we do have choices at this particular point and if it is £4m for playing cricket or it is £4m to keep our care homes open I think we should be keeping our care homes open. You have that choice, if you do not want to exercise that choice that is fine. I am sure the folk in Morley will be aware of Councillor Dawson's exercising his choice at an appropriate time.

Ultimately we are in a situation where you have got to be concerned about the fact that the alternatives at this particular point are of a variable quality and we must do everything that we can. These folk are some of the most vulnerable, they are very old individuals, they need to make sure that they are in accommodation that is equal or better than what they have got at this particular point and the independent sector is variable. Unless we can get those quality standards up then I think it is a great opportunity to have a pause, give it a couple of years and see where we are at that particular point. Thank you, Lord Mayor, and we would like a recorded vote, please. *(applause)*

THE LORD MAYOR: Recorded vote.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Those present 89; those in favour of the motion 26; those against 60, abstentions 3. That is LOST.

The second amendment in the name of Councillor Golton.

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

THE LORD MAYOR: Present 89, those for the motion 29; those against 60; abstentions zero. That is LOST.

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

The substantive motion in the name of Councillor Charlwood. *(A vote was taken)* That is CARRIED.

COUNCILLOR CLEASBY: There were telephones going off several times during the meeting, Lord Mayor. I hope Members will be honourable and give a contribution to your charity.

THE LORD MAYOR: That is very kind of you. I heard one phone going off, I think it was Councillor McKenna's. *(laughter)* Thank you.

(The meeting closed at 8.00pm)