

Minutes of a meeting of the Bradford East Area Committee held on Thursday 11 February 2016 at City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 1800
Concluded 1909

PRESENT – Councillors

LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT	BRADFORD INDEPENDENT GROUP
Iqbal	Fear	F Khan
Jamil	Griffiths	
H U Khan	J Sunderland	
Salam	R Sunderland	

Observer: Councillors I Khan and Stelling

44. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR (Standing Order 35)

Resolved –

That Councillor H U Khan be appointed Chair of the Bradford East Area Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2015/2016.

ACTION: Interim City Solicitor

Councillor H U Khan in the Chair

45. APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CHAIR (Standing Order 35)

Resolved –

That Councillor Salam be appointed Deputy Chair of the Bradford East Area Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2015/2016.

ACTION: Interim City Solicitor

46. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

The following disclosures of interest were received in the interests of clarity:



- (1) Councillor J Sunderland was on the Springfield Centre Management Committee and involved in Inspired Neighbourhoods in relation to minute 52.
- (2) Councillor Salam was involved with the Newton Street Day Centre and the Parkside Community Centre in relation to minute 52.

ACTION: Interim City Solicitor

47. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2016 be signed as a correct record (previously circulated).

48. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

49. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.

50. AN OBJECTION TO A PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER ON LEEDS ROAD NEAR SEYMOUR STREET, BRADFORD

Bowling and Barkerend

The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration (**Document “T”**) considered an objection to a recently advertised Traffic Regulation Order for No Waiting At Any Time restrictions on Leeds Road, Bradford at its junction with Seymour Street.

Members made the following comments:

- There was Ward Councillor support for the Hindu temple which was most affected by the proposal.
- Most people cross to get to the bus stop.
- Moving the pedestrian refuge island further down the road would cause problems for businesses and it would be difficult for buses to get through.
- The scheme should be abandoned as a pedestrian refuge island was not necessary in this area.
- Safety should be a higher priority than parking issues.
- Coaches would struggle to park and drop off 60 persons. Coaches come every week with people. If the refuge island was placed in the area then space would be lost.
- I would hesitate to move the refuge island nearer the junction it would cause more accidents as people would cross Leeds Road.
- There were not any problems around the Hindu temple.
- There was also an educational centre at the Hindu Temple.
- It was important to protect children crossing the road
- There was a pelican crossing nearby, one up the road and also traffic lights.
- It was important to consider the views of businesses and local community residents.



The Principal Engineer responded to members comments and made the following points:

- The proposed design allows sufficient space for vehicles to pass parked coaches at this location however it would be possible to locate the island slightly nearer to the junction which should further alleviate any concerns..

Resolved –

- (1) **That the scheme for the pedestrian refuge island and associated Traffic Regulation Order be abandoned.**
- (2) **That the objector be informed accordingly.**

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

51. PETITIONS RELATING TO TRAFFIC MATTERS

The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration (**Document “U”**) considered the following petitions relating to traffic matters:

- (1) Leeds Road, Bradford – Request for safety cameras **Bowling and Barkerend**
 - (2) Sandford Road, Bradford – Request for additional traffic calming **Bradford Moor**
- (1) **Leeds Road, Bradford – Request for safety cameras**

Members made the following comments:

- The view of Ward Councillors was important in respect of this matter.
- What time of day were the statistics from?
- There were serious accidents last year but I am not sure how it compares with other areas.
- It was necessary to try and get people to change their behaviour.
- A Bradford Safety event was held and we told the community the Council would contribute to camera cost. This recommendation in the officer report was not what I expected.
- During any night, cars were moving over 36mph and there was anti-social behaviour.
- There are particular cameras in Nottingham which use facial recognition to identify people. This has reduced anti-social behaviour.
- An adequate solution was needed for Leeds Road and Killinghall Road.
- There was not much anti-social behaviour during the day of the survey. The worst period was during the night.
- Anti-social behaviour was the main problem not the layout of the road. Safety cameras would just shift the problem elsewhere. Enforcement should be used.
- There should be a Bradford wide solution.
- There was a need to catch the people who were creating the problems.
- Can we do anything as a Committee and make a decision to put a camera on this road?
- Was this issue about safety cameras or to get rid of anti-social behaviour?
- The same people were causing most of the problems.
- The Automatic Nameplate Recognition system could be utilised on Leeds Road and Barkerend Road in a different way and we should talk to the Police about this. It should be possible to deal with 10 or 15 people who were doing anti-social behaviour.



The two Principal Engineers present at the meeting responded to members comments and made the following points:

- The surveys were taken over a number of days. The figures presented take into account a full range of speeds.
- The Automatic Nameplate Recognition System cameras were used by the Police for high level crime rather than catching people speeding.
- The Automatic Nameplate Recognition system was run by the Police and there was a need to discuss further utilisation of the system with them.
- Safety cameras would not stop the problems / accidents. Pedestrians were also walking in between cars and in front of vehicles. This occurs on any major busy corridor with pedestrian activity and local trade. Right turn collisions make up the majority of injury accidents on Leeds Road.
- Increased enforcement would do more for the corridor than any other action taken.
- Most collisions occur due to human error and humans making very natural mistakes.
- There was no Council function / Committee to bring in cameras. It was an independent body and was evidence based. The Committee could not impose a decision on the partnership.

The petitioner was present at the meeting and made the following point:

- There were 50 accidents and in January / February 2016 a person was run over in Leeds Road.
- A person was racing in Barkerend Road and ended up crashing into a house.
- On Leeds Road five persons including a pregnant person was injured.
- Do we need to wait for a death to occur?
- Why can't we inform the Police?
- My son was in an accident and the person who caused my son's accident was still driving around.
- I lived in BD3 for 30 years and moved to BD2 to get to a better area to bring up my children.
- The Council needs to trust the public.
- I have knocked on doors and people said action should have been taken over the last 10 years.
- People have told us we need these cameras.

A member of the public stated that he was a taxi driver and that speeding usually took place during the evening as during the day you can't even go over 10mph. A documentary should be done about Leeds Road.

(2) **Sandford Road, Bradford – Request for additional traffic calming**

Members made the following comments:

- The petitioner had said the current traffic calming measures were not having an effect.
- Was the existing scheme functioning properly and was it up to the job?
- Another traffic calming hump was not necessary.
- The existing features should be checked to ensure that they were doing their job.

A member of the public stated that the road had sunk down.

The Principal Engineer responded that it was difficult to drive at speeds much above 20mph in this area due to the existing traffic calming and on-street parking arrangements. Inspection of the traffic calming features could be arranged to determine if any maintenance work was required.



Resolved –

- (1) That no further action be taken on the request for safety cameras on Leeds Road.
- (2) That members continue to support those highway safety improvement schemes already prioritised by this Area Committee.
- (3) That officers work with key Safer Roads partners to progress a multi-agency approach to address road safety issues on Leeds Road.
- (4) (i) That officers seek to arrange a meeting with the Deputy Leader and Housing, Planning & Transport Portfolio Holder and West Yorkshire Police to discuss further utilisation of the Automatic Nameplate Recognition System on Leeds Road and Barkerend Road to tackle anti-social driving and that there be a further report to the Committee to inform members of the outcome.

(ii) That officers meet with the petitioner to discuss this issue.
- (5) That no further action be taken on the request for an additional traffic calming feature on Sandford Road.
- (6) That officers inspect the existing traffic calming features on Sandford Road and carry out remedial works if appropriate.
- (7) That the petitioners are informed accordingly.

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

**52. BRADFORD EAST AREA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONS 2015 –
2017 PROGRESS UPDATE All Wards**

The report of the Strategic Director, Environment and Sport (**Document “V”**) outlined the work of the Community Development Workers on behalf of the four commissioned organisations during the period April 2015 to January 2016 to support Ward priorities within the Bradford East Area Ward Plans 2015-2016.

The Ward Officer circulated an Appendix 2 to Document “V” (Core Cost allocation update 2015-2016) which he had forgot to include in the report. He stated that he was happy to meet with Ward Councillors to talk about any of the projects.

Resolved –

- (1) That the work of the Community Development (CD) Workers on behalf of the four commissioned organisations during the period April 2015 to January 2016 to support Ward priorities within the Bradford East Area Ward Plans 2015 - 2016 and the Core Cost allocation 2015 – 2016 be noted.
- (2) That Ward Councillors be more engaged in work undertaken by Community Development Workers.

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



53. **DOMESTIC WASTE AND RECYCLING POLICY**

All Wards

Members noted that the above item had been withdrawn.

Resolved –

That it be noted that the above item was withdrawn.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Environment and Waste Management
NO ACTION

Chair

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

i:\minutes\bea11Feb

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

