

Minutes of a meeting of the Bradford East Area Committee held on 13 November 2014 at City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 1800
Concluded 1935

PRESENT – Councillors

LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT	BRADFORD INDEPENDENT GROUP
I A Khan	Fear	F Khan
Billheimer	Griffiths	
Khaliq	Middleton	
S Khan	Reid	

Observer: Councillor H U Khan

Councillor I A Khan in the Chair

36. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

The following disclosures of interest were received:

- (i) Councillor Griffiths disclosed that he was a General Practitioner and a Liaison Officer - Bradford Districts Locality and Branch Member for YOR Local Medical Committee Ltd (YORLMC) for the subject matter under discussion in Minute 41.
- (ii) Councillor Reid disclosed he was Chairman of Eccleshill Community Association Ltd, in relation to Minute 39.
- (iii) Councillor Khaliq disclosed a pecuniary interest that his son was employed at Thornbury Youth and Community Centre for the subject matter under discussion in Minute 39 and he left the room during consideration of the Community Centre Core Costs element of the report (Document "X").
- (iv) Councillor I Khan disclosed that he was Chair of the Consortia of Ethnic Minority Organisations (COEMO) in relation to Minute 39.

ACTION: Assistant City Solicitor



37. **INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS**

There were no appeals submitted by the public to review decisions to restrict documents.

38. **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

Note: As Councillor Khaliq had declared a pecuniary interest he left the meeting at this point.

39. **ALLOCATION OF COMMUNITY CENTRE CORE COST GRANTS AND All Wards COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS FOR 2015-17**

Previous reference: Minute 25 (2014/2015)

The report of the Strategic Director Environment and Sport (**Document "X"**) outlined the recommendations of the Bradford East Area Committee Grant Advisory Group (GAG) for Community Centre Core Costs and Community Development Grants.

The Stronger Communities Delivery Co-ordinator provided an overview of the report and tabled a document (appendix to Document "X") containing the recommendations of the Committee's GAG in relation to Community Development Grants and outlined the process applied. He stated that, in recommending organisations to receive the funding, coverage across the whole of the Bradford East area was carefully considered. He explained that the proposed funding for 2016-17 was subject to being approved during the Council's budget setting process.

Members considered the Community Centre Core Costs element of the report.

In response to a Member's questions, it was reported that actual (unrestricted) financial reserves of the organisations that applied for funding had been considered during the selection process. None of the bidding organisations reported reserves in excess of £100,000, so they were all considered for the funding.

Members;

Resolved –

- (1) That the recommendations on Core Cost Community Centre Grants made by the Grant Advisory Group, as contained in Table 1 of Document "X", be approved.**

Note: At this point in the proceedings Councillor Khaliq returned to the meeting.

The Stronger Communities Delivery Co-ordinator referred to the information tabled in respect of the Committee's GAG recommendation relating to Community Development grants. The GAG were recommending that the following three organisations be allocated £25,000 for 2015-16 and £25,000 for 2016-17; Ravenscliffe Community Development Project, Thorpe Edge Community Project and West Bowling Community Advice and Training Centre. He explained that the GAG believed there were strengths in both the applications from the Karmand Community Centre and Thornbury Centre and therefore could not decide between the two in terms of recommending an allocation of £25,000 for 2015-16 and £25,000 for 2016-17. The GAG were therefore recommending that these two

organisations be requested to make a presentation to the GAG in order to inform their decision making and that GAG then bring their recommendation back to this Committee for a final decision.

The Chair stated that both the applications from the Karmand Community Centre and the Thornbury Centre had their strengths and it had been difficult for the GAG to reach a conclusion on which to recommend for funding, which had led them to propose that both organisations deliver a presentation.

In response to Members' questions, it was reported that:

- The three organisations recommended for funding were on the basis of 26 hours a week.
- The costs associated with the Community Development grants mainly represented wages therefore it was not deemed appropriate to fund more organisations with lower allocations which would also present a risk of spreading the funding too thinly and not achieving the desired outcomes.
- There was an expectation that Ravenscliffe Community Development Project and the Thorpe Edge Community Project would cover some areas in Bolton and Undercliffe.
- There was an expectation that all funded projects would work in partnership with each other to ensure a good geographical spread.

A Member stated that the Karmand Community Centre was well established and had been delivering community development work for a number of years. He questioned what the Thornbury Centre was proposing to do that Karmand Community Centre was not. In response, the Stronger Communities Delivery Co-ordinator stated that both organisations were proposing to do similar work. He stated that the Expression of Interests (EOIs) were available to view if Members wished to see them. The Member asked whether concerns had been raised with the Karmand Community Centre about their service delivery as they were a current provider. In response, the Chair clarified that a decision had not yet been made on which organisation should be recommended for funding; in considering the funding available, all bidding organisations were being considered afresh; both the Karmand Community Centre and the Thornbury Centre were located close together which needed to be taken into consideration; although the funding could be split between the two organisations, it was not considered to be the best solution in terms of achieving outcomes; the GAG had made their recommendations based on the information available to them in the EOIs; there was a need to get away from the mentality that previously funded organisations would automatically carry on receiving funding; all applications were considered fairly and objectively; it was recommended that only the Karmand Community Centre and the Thornbury Centre be asked to make presentations on their bids; all unsuccessful organisations would not be considered again in this process.

A Member thanked the GAG and all organisations that participated in the process for their work and stated that he was in favour of the GAGs recommendation. He stressed that feedback must not be provided to unsuccessful organisations until all the funding had been allocated.

The Chair stated that an additional meeting of the Committee would need to be arranged prior to the Committee's next scheduled meeting on 22 January 2015 to consider the recommendation from the GAG following the proposed presentations.

A Member stated that, as the Committee were only part way through the funding allocation process, caution needed to be taken when considering what contributions organisations could make at this meeting.

A Member suggested that a decision should not be taken on allocating any of the Community Development grants until the presentations had been made by the two organisations to the GAG and that this Committee make their decision on allocating all the funding at a later date. The Deputy Chair disagreed with the Member's suggestion as she believed the GAG recommendation on refusing funding to unsuccessful organisations should be made today. She stated that if the Committee did not make this decision it would undermine the process. The Member stated that he was not challenging the process but considered it would be better to make the decision on all of the funding together as he believed the fairness of the process could be challenged.

The Chief Executive of COEMO spoke on behalf of the Karmand Community Centre. He referred to the information tabled which stated that "impact assessments were considered where there was the possibility of not funding an organisation which currently receives a commission for community development"; he questioned why no feedback had been given on this matter to those organisations that had applied and stated that the Council had a legal obligation to consider impact assessments. In response, the Chair clarified that any new organisations that had applied were not required to supply this information and that the Council were aware of this information in relation to the organisations currently funded to provide Community Development work in the Bradford East area. The Chief Executive of COEMO stated that the term "grant holder" was used in the information tabled with "Karmand Community Centre or Thornbury Centre" listed below it; this was misleading as neither had yet been recommended for funding. In response, it was clarified that neither organisations were grant holders for 2015-17 as a decision was yet to be made by the GAG.

The Chief Executive of COEMO then made the following points:

- He considered the process the Committee were following to be biased and unlawful.
- The Committee were being asked to approve funding for three organisations and a new organisation (the Thornbury Centre) was being brought into the process unnecessarily. As a new organisation, the Committee should fund the Thornbury Centre from new resources.
- A different process would be applied by the Committee if they approved the request from the GAG for a presentation from the Karmand Community Centre and the Thornbury Centre which was considered to be unfair.
- The Karmand Community Centre had been successfully providing services for the last 10 years; these had been monitored by the Council.
- Following the closure of the Council's Community Development Service in 2004, the Council had decided to continue providing community development services via satellite activities. The needs of the area surrounding the Karmand Community Centre were different to those surrounding the Thornbury Centre. The Karmand Community Centre was in the most deprived area of Bradford and there were concerns that if the centre did not receive further funding it could lead to an increase in crime in the area.
- The same process should be followed to consider all the applications received.
- The Committee were urged to consider the negative impact on the area if the Karmand Community Centre did not receive future funding for the services it provided and stated that if there were any elements of the service the Council were not happy with that conditions be placed on future funding allocations.

In response to the comments made by the Chief Executive of COEMO, the Chair reiterated that the GAG had not made a decision yet on whether or not to propose the Karmand Community Centre for future Community Development funding.

Resolved –

- (2) That the recommendations on Community Development grants made by the Grant Advisory Group and tabled at the meeting be approved as below:

Wards	Organisation	Allocation		Notes
		2015-16	2016-17	
Bradford Moor/ Bowling and Barkerend (excluding East Bowling)	Karmand Community Centre Or Thornbury Centre	£25,000	£25,000	Grant Advisory Group to hear presentation from both and make recommendation based on this back to Area Committee
Bolton and Undercliffe / Idle and Thackley / Eccleshill	Ravenscliffe Community Development Project	£25,000	£25,000	Funded at current level which represents 26 hrs
	Thorpe Edge Community Project	£25,000	£25,000	Funded at current level which represents 26 hrs
Little Horton & East Bowling	West Bowling Community Advice & Training Centre	£25,000	£25,000	Funded at current level which represents 26 hrs
All CD workers expected to work in any Bradford East wards under request via Area Coordinator				
Total		£100,000	£100,000	

- (3) That the Grants Advisory Group be thanked for the work they have undertaken for the Committee.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Corporate
ACTION: Strategic Director, Environment and Sport**

In accordance with paragraph 25.6 of part 3A of the Constitution Councillor Khaliq requested that his abstention from voting on the above Resolution be recorded.

**40. LOCAL HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE –
DEVOLUTION UPDATE AND FUNCTION OVERVIEW**

All Wards

The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture (**Document “V”**) detailed how the service currently managed the Local Highway Maintenance (LHM) function and allocated resources. It also updated the Committee with regard to current operations being undertaken on the network and the indicative costs of works undertaken in the current financial year.

The Principal Engineer provided a summary of the report. In response to Members' questions he stated that:

- Although 76.9% of the budget for the current financial year had been spent, he was confident that the budget for the remainder of the year could be managed effectively as highway maintenance costs were expected to slow down entering into the winter period.
- Work had been left incomplete on Marshfield Place due to threats received by staff whilst on site. The site had been left in a safe condition and would be revisited. An error had been made in listing it as 'completed' in Appendix 5 of Document “V”.

A Member thanked the officer for the report and highlighted that there needed to be enough money in the budget to undertake necessary category 1 and category 2 repairs. He considered that as category 3 and category 4 repairs were ranked on a priority needs basis, there was not a lot of leeway for the Committee to make any alternative decisions on how

the budget was allocated.

Resolved –

- (1) **That the current operational methods adopted for Local Highway Maintenance be noted.**
- (2) **That the indicative costs to date for the 2014/15 financial year be noted.**
- (3) **That the list of current and proposed CAT3/4 works as shown in Appendices 5 and 6 of Document “V” be approved.**

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture

41. CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUPS

All Wards

The report of the Strategic Director, Environment and Sport (**Document “W”**) provided an overview of the work of Bradford City and Bradford Districts Clinical Commissioning Groups in the Bradford East Area and requested views and comments from the Committee.

The Director of Strategy of Bradford Districts CCG provided a brief overview of the report.

Members’ made the following comments:

- Hillside Bridge Health Centre provided a valuable service in the Bowling and Barkerend Ward.
- It was welcomed that GP Practices were no longer using premium 0844/0845 telephone numbers.
- People in the Little Horton Ward complained on not being able to access GP appointments; cases of calls not being answered by Receptionists in GP Practices were stated.
- There needed to be more cross working between the CCGs and the voluntary and community sector.
- That the figures of new people diagnosed with diabetes (as outlined in paragraph 1.2 within the Appendix of the report) were concerning as they represented almost 30% of the people tested.

In response to Members’ questions, it was reported that:

- Work was being undertaken to consider how improvements could be made in terms of access to GPs as well as considering what was considered to be fair demand on GPs. A review was being undertaken of how the system worked and how to educate patients so that they used GP Practices appropriately.
- Following voluntary and community sector budget cuts there had been an increase in patients accessing GP appointments linked to social isolation.
- If patients had particular concerns about a GP Practice they could complain to the Patient Advice and Liaison Service (PALS).
- The CCGs were willing to work in partnership with the voluntary and community sector.
- The performance of GP Practices was measured and was publically available.

The Chair raised concerns that, from his experience, there was resistance from Bradford City CCG to engage and work with the voluntary and community sector.

A Member stated that, although there was the opportunity to complain to PALS about how services were delivered, and particularly with reference to complaints about the attitude of reception staff at GP Practices, he was concerned that the same service would still be delivered but in a more polite manner, which did not solve the overall problems people were experiencing in accessing GP appointments. The Director of Strategy stated that whilst rude behaviour was unacceptable, there were limited resources available and some GP Practices could only see a certain number of patients per hour. Schemes such as Pharmacy First which aimed to relieve pressure on GP appointments were being delivered through some pharmacies throughout Bradford City and more work was being done to promote self care and prevention.

Resolved –

That the information provided in Document “W” be noted.

NO ACTION

**42. STREET LIGHTING COLUMN
REPLACEMENT PROGRAMME**

**Bolton and Undercliffe/
Bowling and Barkerend/
Idle and Thackley**

The report of the Strategic Director Regeneration and Culture (**Document “Y”**) sought to advise the Area Committee regarding the replacement of street lighting columns determined as non compliant and the subsequent recommendations as to how the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Funding allocation could be most effectively utilised.

The Principal Engineer provided a summary of the report, outlining the Priority 1 schemes listed in Appendix 1 of Document “Y” recommended for implementation.

A Member stated that the Priority 2 scheme for Mayo Avenue, listed in Table 2 of the appendix was located within Bradford South, not Bradford East. It was clarified that the Committee’s available budget would not increase following removal of this scheme from the list as it was not a scheme recommended for approval.

The Chair requested that Lonsdale Street be added to the list of outstanding schemes.

Resolved –

That the Priority 1 street lighting column replacement schemes listed in Table 1 of Appendix 1 of the report be implemented.

***OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management
ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture***

Chair

Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Bradford West Area Committee.