

# Minutes of a meeting of the Bradford West Area Committee held on Wednesday 24 February 2016 at City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 1800  
Adjourned 1852  
Reconvene 1858  
Concluded 1922

## PRESENT – Councillors

| LABOUR    | BRADFORD INDEPENDENTS | CONSERVATIVE |
|-----------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Amran     | Collector             | Sykes        |
| Azam      |                       |              |
| Dunbar    |                       |              |
| Duffy     |                       |              |
| Engel     |                       |              |
| M Shabbir |                       |              |
| Shaheen   |                       |              |

Observer: Councillor V Slater, Portfolio Holder for Housing, Planning and Transport

## Councillor Engel in the Chair

### 43. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

The following disclosures in matters under consideration were received:

- Councillors Duffy, Dunbar and Sykes disclosed that they had been involved with the Keelham petition (Minute 46).
- During the course of the meeting, Councillor Sykes disclosed that he was a Governor of Keelham Primary School (Minute 46).
- The Chair and Councillor Azam disclosed that they were members of the Greenmore Big Local Board (Minute 47).
- During the course of the meeting, Councillor Shaheen disclosed that she worked in a community centre and had worked on a project with the Greenmore Big Local (Minute 47).

As the disclosures were made on the basis of transparency, Members remained in the meeting during consideration and voting of the items.

### 44. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

### 45. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions submitted by the public.



46. **PETITION REQUESTING THE INTRODUCTION OF A '20MPH ZONE' ON THAT SECTION OF WELL HEADS AND A644 BRIGHOUSE ROAD RUNNING ADJACENT TO KEELHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL, WELL HEADS**

*Bingley Rural  
Thornton & Allerton*

The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration (**Document "S"**) considered an e-petition, the title of which requested the introduction of a '20mph zone' on a section of Well Heads and A644 Brighouse Road running adjacent to Keelham Primary School. The petition further expressed concern regarding traffic speeds within the vicinity of the school, and made a specific request for the introduction of a Home Zone.

The petition was presented to Full Council on 19 January 2016, where it was resolved that the petition be referred to the Bradford West and Shipley Area Committees for their consideration.

The Principal Engineer was in attendance who was accompanied by the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Planning and Transport.

The Principal Engineer gave a synopsis of the report. In addition he highlighted that no collisions had occurred in the past 5 years. There was a limited budget for traffic calming measures for the district. A few measures had been implemented at this location nevertheless there was ongoing engagement for a number of years relating to concerns expressed at this junction. There used to be a School Crossing Patrol but the person had retired. Officers had carried out an assessment but this location had not met the criteria. There had been issues raised on the narrowness of the road also. There were issues around HGVs driving over footpaths during the turning point at the junction therefore traffic calming required accommodation of such vehicles. The main thrust of resolving concerns would be to take ownership of a small corner part of land of Keelham Primary School. If the issue was resolved to implement traffic calming then this would junction would become dangerous without the additional land from Keelham Primary School. In relation to the opposite side of the junction, this was privately owned land and the owner did not wish to sell.

At this point, a Member of the Committee presented a statement by the lead petitioner which he wished to be read out to the Committee. It was read:

*"There had been relentless ongoing campaigning for better road safety around school and therefore it was important for the Committee to consider the proposals for a 20mph zone alongside other traffic calming measures. It was also known that safety measures were not deemed a priority because there had not been enough accidents of a serious nature, hence indirectly being told that lives had to be sacrificed before any form of traffic calming measure could be implemented. The consideration of traffic measures had to be addressed as a matter of prevention and urgency".*

The Portfolio Holder at this stage praised the lead petitioner for his hard work and dedication in bringing the matter to the authority. She then stated that if the Council had the financial resources, then a 20mph zone could be applied but the fact remained that enforcement would still remain an issue which would entail Police presence. An option remained to widen the corner, if a corner of the land from the school was used but the Governors of the school had not been receptive to the idea of the land being used for this purpose despite expressing favour to the traffic calming measures. Nevertheless this was not an academy but a community school and therefore the land of the school belonging to the Council. Legal advice had been sought and a judgement was being waited on to date whether the necessary part of the land of school could be utilised for traffic calming purposes.



The Committee asked a number of questions to which the Principal Engineer and the Portfolio Holder responded, as follows:

- Clarification was sought as to the significantly high costs in the implementation of traffic calming measures, as highlighted in 4.4 of the report?
  - A 20mph zone enforcement activity was a delegated responsibility to the Chief of Police in any city, thus third party enforcement measures were inadmissible and the use of self enforcement measures had to be applied;
- Explanation was sought for 2.7 of the report?
  - The 85% was a characteristic of a traffic speed that most closely conformed to a speed limit which was considered safe, reasonable and was inserted in all reports to shed light to the Committee on the average traffic speed of the highways subject under discussion.
    - The Committee thanked the Principal Engineer on the explanation but equally expressed its concerns as raised by the parents of children attending Keelham Primary School that these speeds were still excessive for children using this junction and that a 20mph zone had to be applied for the safety of not only children but all pedestrians;
- Was there any possibility that some vehicles could be restricted in using this junction?
  - This element had been considered but there was no alternative route and the fact that all vehicles had a right of access through the junction. If the Council implemented a restriction, singling out a particular type of vehicle/s, then the decision would be challenged;
- Could adaptations be made across the opposite side of the road?
  - This would not be possible as it was private land;
- Was there an indication by the Principal Engineer that traffic calming was not required on the junction?
  - It was not that traffic calming was not required but the fact that 20mph would not work due to the nature of the junction.
    - The issue remained on how to deal with this junction because the safety of children was paramount. The Principal Engineer has made a case that the Council possessed a limited budget and therefore unable to address every issue. Shipley Area Committee had to finance schemes but on the basis of priority;
- This issue had been ongoing for some time now and why was the Council unable to come up with a solution?
  - The solution would entail obtaining the land from the school in order to widen the junction;
- What was the likelihood of fatalities by HGVs?
  - Following calculations, a car travelling at the speed of 30mph would result in the 80% chance of a person surviving an accident but if a car travelling at the speed of 40mph then there was an 80% chance of a pedestrian dying from the impact of being hit. However there was no history of accidents at this junction;
    - The evidence explained was appreciated but using this junction heavily could eventually result in a major accident which could be prevented now by the implementation a 20mph zone; and,
- The implementation of a 20mph zone would prevent excessive speed of vehicles but seemed the Council was trying to steer away from implementing this specific traffic calming feature. Alternatively was it possible just to put up signs of for the reduction of speed?
  - Action was only taken on severe highway issues and this junction had no history of accidents. The implementation of a 20, or even a 30mph zone would not work at this junction.



During the discussion, the Committee, the Principal Engineer and the Portfolio Holder made the following comments:

- The local community and Ward Members were aware of the issues on this section of the road but equally the Council had to adhere to its current financial position;
- The Portfolio Holder had made a strong statement but the fact remained that the road had to be widened significantly therefore a considerable amount of land had to be used in order to accommodate the large HGVs using this junction;
- If the road was widened then a Bell Bollard could be used to solve multiple traffic management problems and had a history of saving lives;
- 20mph had been implanted on Duchy Avenue (Heaton Ward) and a few other streets, this traffic measure had altered the speeds and behaviour of motorists, also being the probable cause of lives being saved;
- The service was bound by regulation and there was a process to deliver the greatest traffic calming needs at first point due to the Council's financial situation. It was important to look at schemes that had the highest injuries and collisions and if traffic calming was implemented at this junction, as to the request of the petition, then other much greater schemes with significant highway concerns would be affected;
- This junction was in a difficult situation because it was unique to the extent that most schools in the district did not have large HGVs passing them;
- There had been a number of spillages from the HGVs but none have occurred directly outside the school;
- The information on spillages was appreciated but these were still occurring and immediately cleaned up;
- There seemed a consensus that an accident should occur before applying a traffic measure to this junction. This would be a tragedy if occurred and would not be in favour of helping the users of the junction that have requested the help of the Council; and,
- Budget could be made available but a legal issue seemed an obstacle at present which the Portfolio Holder confirmed that she was in pursuit of.

The Chair reiterated to the Committee that the part of the road under discussion was not in the boundary of the Bradford West area and therefore a decision to apply traffic measures was not for this Committee to make but to express concerns only as Keelham Primary School, which was located at the junction, fell into the Thornton and Allerton Ward, therefore:

#### **Resolved –**

- (1) **That Shipley Area Committee be requested to look favourably upon this petition and act to address the concerns raised, which are shared by the Bradford West Area Committee, in particular, to have regard to the implementation of a '20mph zone'.**
- (2) **That Officers continue to pursue all options with a view to improving road safety measures at that section of Well Heads and A644 Brighouse Road running adjacent to Keelham Primary School, Well Heads.**
- (3) **That, in addition to the lead petitioner being informed accordingly, he also be formally praised for his community spirit and the arduous work undertaken to bring this subject matter to the attention of the Council.**

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

#### **47. GREENMOOR BIG LOCAL– SCHOLEMOOR AND LIDGET GREEN**

The report of the Strategic Director, Environment and Sport (**Document "T"**) informed Bradford West Area Committee on the progress to develop the GreenMoor Big Local Programme.



The Bradford West Area Co-ordinator introduced the report.

Also in attendance was the Chair of Greenmoor Big Local who gave a summation of the organisation. He stated that Scholemoor and Lidget Green in Bradford had been allocated £1million to spend on making the area a better place to live as part of a pioneering Big Lottery Fund scheme to put decision making power in the hands of local people. Big Local was an exciting opportunity for residents in the Lidget Green & Scholemoor Area of Bradford to have a say in how one million pounds was spent in their neighbourhood which would make a lasting positive difference to where they lived. It was about bringing together all the local talent, ambitions, skills and energy from individuals, groups and organisations who wished to make their area an even better place to live.

The Community Board of the organisation consisted of 15 local residents and three Councillors. The organisation took a while to get going but was now at its pinnacle in operations. Out of a 100 similar organisations across the country, Greenmoor Big Local (Scholemoor and Lidget Green) was deemed at the top end for its performance. The Community Board met every 6 weeks, was currently supporting 14 that also included 2 European groups. A flagship project was attended by the Lord Mayor in 2015 to which around 400 attendees attended the event. There had been a significant amount of input by Councillors. The organisation was continuously trying to search out flagship projects that it could support for the benefit of the people. The organisation was continuously working with also community groups and assisting in individual groups to become self sustainable with no further funds from the Greenmore Big Local.

A question and answer session ensued:

- The report had no mention of the amount of money spent to date?
  - Out of £100,000, £43,000 had been spent but this also involved pulling money from other sources;
- To who was the organisation accountable to?
  - This work related directly to the Local Government Act 2000 and to the Duty of Wellbeing placed upon the Council to promote and improve the well-being of the District and the Council was a partner. The organisation had been signed off by Central Government in London and now overseen by CNET (Bradford's local Community Empowerment Network);
- From which parts of Bradford were the community groups funded located?
  - The projects funded had to be for the sole purpose of the Lidget Green & Scholemoor Area of Bradford;
- How visionary were the Community Board members?
  - There were plans for long term bigger projects; and,
- Due to the amount of money the organisation had, what support was given towards childcare and nursery?
  - The organisation was not allowed to support Statutory Provision.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the progress in the development of the Greenmoor Big Local Programme be noted and welcomed.**
- (2) That the Board Members of the Greenmoor Big Local and individuals who are not part of the board but have made contributions towards projects, be commended for the work undertaken to date.**

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



48. **COMMUNITY CHEST 2015/2016**

*All Wards in Bradford West*

The report of the Assistant Director, Neighbourhood and Customer Services (**Document “U”**) detailed the Community Chest Grants awarded from applications received from 1 October 2015 – 31 December 2015 for the benefit of communities within Bradford West.

**Resolved –**

- (1) **That the wide range of applications from groups, organisations and individuals across Bradford West are noted and welcomed.**
- (2) **That the Bradford West Area Co-ordinator’s Office continue to ensure the effective allocation of the Community Chest Budget by providing appropriate advice and support to applicants.**

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: Corporate**

**ACTION: Assistant Director, Neighbourhood and Customer Services**

Chair

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

minutes\bwe24Feb16

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

