

# Minutes of a meeting of the Bradford West Area Committee held on 12 November 2014 at City Hall, Bradford

---

Commenced	1810
Concluded	2000

## PRESENT – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	BRADFORD INDEPENDENT GROUP
Sykes	Azam	Collector
	Dunbar	
	Engel	
	Arshad Hussain	
	Shabir Hussain	
	Mohammed	
	Thirkill	

Observers: Councillors Ahmed, Amir Hussain and Shabbir

## Councillor Arshad Hussain in the Chair

### 38. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

The following disclosure of interest was received:

The Chair disclosed that all Committee Members were colleagues of the Chief Executive of Grange Interlink, an organisation that had received a Community Centre Core Costs Grant, as a fellow Elected Member in respect of Minute 43.

***ACTION: City Solicitor***

### 39. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

### 40. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.



41. **NOMINATION TO LIST LAND AS AN ASSET OF  
COMMUNITY VALUE - THE FORMER REGISTER  
OFFICE, MANOR ROW, BRADFORD**

City

The Council received a nomination to list land and property known as The Former Register Office, Manor Row, Bradford as an Asset of Community Value under the Localism Act 2011. The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture (**Document “V”**) considered whether the nomination and nominated asset met the Asset of Community Value Criteria set out in the Localism Act and contained a recommendation as to whether or not the nomination should be approved.

The Estates Manager, Programmes was in attendance and gave a synopsis of the report during the outset.

The Chief Executive of Bradnet was also in attendance and made representations in favour of the community right to bid for The Former Register Office. In summary, he outlined that Bradnet expressed favour in the building to be put on the register of buildings in which community organisations could have an interest to purchase as part of the Community Right to Bid legislation. However the Council intended to dispose of the building as part of an asset realignment programme. In the meantime Bradnet had sought advice from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), to which it was advised that the Act left Local Authorities with significant latitude to determine the meaning of social well-being at a local level and this could also cover the registry office to the extent that there were a number of ways that community assets could be used to promote general social well-being. To reject the request at the first stage was not in the spirit of the Act and it was important to allow Bradnet to assemble a suitable purchase plan.

At this point, the Committee asked whether the building was still operational and did the Council hold intentions to utilise the building in the future. In response it was confirmed that there was no activity ongoing and that the Council held no intentions for operations in the future.

The Committee further stated that the procedure followed to assess the building was questionable. It was difficult to understand why the building was fully operational when used as the Register’s Office but suddenly it could no longer be in use for a community purpose. In response, it was explained that the procedure had been followed. The interpretation of ‘Social Well Being’ as stated in the legislation, in particular marriage ceremonies where families were invited to attend were only occasions and not regular activity. It had been concluded that this use could not be interpreted as ‘community’ and therefore the criteria for listing was not met.

The Committee then expressed its reservations as to reasons behind the decision to auction. In reply, it was said that the disposal procedure had been followed in accordance with the legislation.

The Committee received the following comments:

- It was important for this building to go out to consultation and give organisations the opportunity to bid;
- There was a lack of communication from the Department responsible in overseeing the Assets of Community Value;
- The legalities in the procedure followed for the building seemed questionable; and,
- It was paramount for the building to be withdrawn from the auction in order to give interested parties the opportunity to have the building registered as a community asset.

The Chair concluded that no real explanation on the legality of procedure followed had been outlined and therefore:

**Resolved –**

- (1) **That the former Register Office, Manor Row, Bradford be withdrawn from auction.**
- (2) **That the consideration of nomination of land and property known as the former Register Office, Manor Row, Bradford as an Asset of Community Value be deferred and brought back to the Bradford West Area Committee for consideration in June 2015.**
- (3) **That during deferment, opportunity be given for organisations to bid for the former Register Office, Manor Row, Bradford.**
- (4) **That legal explanation be sought and presented to the Bradford West Area Committee in December 2014 on the legislation and implementation for applications to list assets of community value.**

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

**42. NEIGHBOURHOOD TEAM SUPPORT HUB**

All Wards in  
Bradford West

The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration and Culture (**Document “W”**) provided the Bradford West Area Committee with an update of the Neighbourhood Team Support Hub and how this approach had made improvements to integrated working between the Council, Police and partners across the District.

The Safer Communities Delivery Co-ordinator alongside Police Inspector Rhees-Cooper? was in attendance and gave an outline of the report.

A question and answer session ensued:

- The Committee sought reasons as to the significant increase in ASB interventions since the launch of the hub in May 2014 and whether this increase was due to the successful operation of the hub?
  - It was explained that since the launch, significant improvements had been made to partnership activities at a low level. Officers now split their time, spending some in the PCT and some in the hub. This assisted various officers from wide ranging communities sharing the same office and communicating more effectively and resulting in successful outcomes;
- How was it intended to share the “tactical assessment details crimes”?
  - There was a significant amount of restricted information contained in the assessment details however this was communicated to the Police, Ward Officers and the Area Co-ordinators;
- It seemed the work undertaken to date was excellent but why did statistics fail to give a reflection of this?
  - A considerable amount of progress had been made and there was a great deal of ongoing promotion for people to be made aware and contact the hub. In relation to statistics, it was important to note that the hub had only been in operation since July 2014.

The Committee commended the work undertaken to reduce the number of quad bikes.

**Resolved –**

**That the update of the Neighbourhood Team Support Hub be noted.**

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

43. **ALLOCATION OF COMMUNITY CENTRE CORE COST AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS** All Wards in  
Bradford West

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

The Committee received two petitions at the meeting; one from Millan Centre containing 78 signatures opposing the proposal not to award the organisation a Community Development Grant, and a further petition from Frizinghall Community Centre containing 561 signatures, supporting the Frizinghall Community Association to continue to provide community development work in the area of Heaton and Frizinghall.

The Stronger Communities Delivery Co-ordinator was present and gave a synopsis of the report.

The Chair then allowed speakers of organisations to make representations to the Committee. The following verbal representations were made:

- The Chief Executive of Consortia of Ethnic Minority Organisations (COEMO) sector spoke on behalf of all three organisations that were not successful with their Expressions of Interest for a Community Development Grant. He explained that he was disappointed with the whole process pursued and there had been no justification for the Committee to approve the recommendation of GAG. It was not acceptable to suggest that these organisations had not met the expectations of community development activities as opposed to previous years when decisions were made in favour of the organisations. Officers working in these organisations were following their job descriptions and the Council’s protocol. This was about individuals as employees appointed years ago to support communities. It was not correct for officers to suggest that officers appointed to work at these centres were not undertaking their role appropriately without any evidence. The Millan Centre had been working with women for a number of years and there would be implications of people not engaging if this centre was no longer supported. African communities were being engaged with through wide ranging community activity programmes led by Manningham Mills Sports and Community Association and it was incorrect for officers to conclude that this centre was not engaging. The Bradford West area was the most deprived area in the country and the decision of GAG would have detrimental impacts on the area. The decision made was a reflection of injustice and inequality of law. The Council was forcing these organisations to complain to the Local Government Ombudsman or to apply for Judicial Reviews. There was only a small amount of funding and it was critical that money was given to organisations that were already placed, experienced and leading the way in community activities over the past 10 years.

- The Chair of Millan Centre expressed her disappointment on the recommendation of GAG and highlighted whether any research had been undertaken by officers and presented to GAG before its recommendation. Millan Centre took the responsibility for specific work tailored especially for women. That she had been the Chair for over 10 years and in this time she had seen the increase of new groups gaining access to the centre, hence the need for the centre's services. Following Bradford disturbances, young men were trying to access the centre and staff were being careful and extra vigilant, ensuring the women were kept separated so that their privacy was not intruded.
- A representative for Manningham Mills Sports and Community Association explained his reservations to the Committee. He commenced by expressing his disagreement to the Stronger Communities Delivery Co-ordinator explanation as contained in the report. The centre's community development activities had not just been restricted to the Bradford West area but the whole District. The withdrawal of funding would mean to marginalise the work of the centre. The Community Development worker was ever-increasingly networking with all agencies and people. Manningham Mills Sports and Community Association was originally commissioned for African Caribbean groups, many based in Bradford West but also included groups across the District.

In response to representations, the Stronger Communities Delivery Co-ordinator outlined that there was less funding available and therefore budget constraints increased pressure. The representative from Manningham Mills Sports and Community Association was correct in his statement that the centre's work included the supporting of African Caribbean/African communities across the District and not only the West area. However the post had always been partly to support generic community development work for the African Caribbean/African communities which historically have been based in the Bradford West area.

A Heaton Ward Councillor was present at the meeting outlined that community development work was a continual element in all communities and required rigorous individuals to deliver the correct form of programme. The work eventually took shape and made a difference through a long term based approach. The West area covered a large geographical area and was accompanied with many community issues. The fact that GAG recommended not to award the three previous organisations that had always received funding was only a drop in the ocean. It was paramount that resources be increased for the sake of a positive transformation but there were increasing pressures on the budget. The organisations that were unsuccessful in their bids assume that a unfair process was followed and without funding there was a real risk of the centres closing. Community centres also had significant costs towards the running of centres. The Frizinghall Zaika Group was a cooking programme and was linked with the Council's agenda priorities, as part of an initiative to promote cohesion and tackle social issues within Bradford. There were many communities in the West area including Roma communities that also had issues. Frizinghall Community Association and its work was important for the community and it was paramount that its work continued by the increasing of core cost funding. It was paramount that all avenues be exhausted before a final decision was made such as whether it would be practical for Community Development workers be shared between all wards.

A question and answer session ensued:

- How did monitoring take place over the past 10 years?
  - Monitoring had been undertaken for the past 10 years and was previously the responsibility of Adult Services but now through Neighbourhood Services. Community Development Commission was now geared more towards external outside community work as opposed to centre based;

- What was the response to the accusations being made?
  - Representatives made cases that the recommendations of GAG were not appropriate however the recommendations of GAG were based on a robust decision as outlined in the report;
- How would community development work continue in the areas if centres were no longer to receive funding for community development work?
  - The successful grant holders would go out to the community to assist in the delivery of community projects. Help educating the community in cleaner streets and other significant potential areas; and,
- Was there time for the awards to be deferred so that meetings and consultations be held?
  - This part of the process had previously taken place and organisation representatives had attended. All Bradford West Elected Members were also invited to the meeting.

Members made the following comments:

- It was acknowledged that there was a reduction in funding however it would be better if cuts were made elsewhere as opposed to targeting vulnerable communities;
- The work would continue but would be delivered differently that would have a greater impact on communities;
- Irish communities had poor health outcomes and this was due to the lack of special community activities to assist in its needs, this being an example that not every community was able to be provided for with the reduced funding;
- It was important to fund centres that would deliver the appropriate value for money community activities that would have a greater impact; and,
- Community Development Workers should be continuously working externally as opposed to being based in community centres.

#### **Resolved –**

- (1) That the recommendations on Core Cost Community Centre Grants made by the Grant Advisory Group be approved.**
- (2) That the recommendations on Community Development grants made by the Grant Advisory Group to fund Cnet, Gurlington Community Association and Lower Grange Community Association to the value of £25,000 each be approved.**
- (3) That the Grants Advisory Group in consultation with the Bradford West Area Co-ordinator be requested to make further recommendations on how to use the remaining contingency funds to provide transitional support to the organisations that previously held a Community Development Commission.**
- (4) That the performance of the successful community development grants holders be monitored over the 12 months period. That grant holders also be requested to present an in-depth report to the Bradford West Area Committee in 12 months of the Grant Agreement detailing the activities and impact their work has had on the communities they supported.**
- (5) That the recommendations on how to mitigate against the potential impacts on communities that may no longer be able to access provision at the three organisations who are currently receiving a Community Development Commission be accepted.**

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

#### 44. **STREET LIGHTING COLUMN REPLACEMENT PROGRAMME**

City,  
Thornton & Allerton  
Heaton, Manningham

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 is most effectively utilised.

The Principal Engineer was in attendance and introduced the report.

A question and answer session followed:

- The columns on Manningham Lane were operational and seemed in good condition. What were the reasons behind the replacement scheme?
  - The columns had been installed in the 1970's and 1980's. They looked good due to the painted finish however they were aluminium on the inside and had started to corrode;
- Why had all wards not been included in the Priority 1 Replacement Scheme?
  - Columns in other areas were used as example and compared to columns in these wards. Those that would cause significant problems such as collapsing would be replaced first;
- Would schemes that were listed as Priority 2 be considered as Priority 1 next year?
  - Yes;
- LED lighting was supposed to be more efficient and economical to run but why were there instances when a light was not working after a short time of new installation of columns?
  - A management system was used previously to control the lighting and the lighting that had failed was probably due to the operation of the system. However the service was now moving away from the system; and
- Was all of Legrams Lane included for columns replacement?
  - Only a part of the road.

The Committee highlighted that any lighting in busy major roads such as Manningham Lane encountering any form of problem should always be rectified immediately due to their heavy usage.

**Resolved –**

**That the Priority 1 street lighting column replacement schemes as listed in Table 1 of Appendix 1, attached to Document “Y”, 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.**

i:\minutes\bwe12Nov

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER