

## Minutes of a meeting of the Executive held on Tuesday, 12 September 2017 at Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.35 am  
Concluded 12.20 pm

### Members of the Executive – Councillors

<b>LABOUR</b>
Hinchcliffe (Chair)
V Slater
I Khan
Ross-Shaw
Ferriby
Jabar

Observers: Councillors Engel, Hawkesworth, Poulsen and Shaheen

#### 24. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

No disclosures of interest in matters under consideration were received at this point in the meeting, however see Minute 35.

#### 25. MINUTES

**Resolved –**

**That the minutes of the meetings held on 20 June and 11 July 2017 be signed as a correct record.**

#### 26. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

**27. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EXECUTIVE**

**1. Council 18 JULY 2017 PETITION KEEP CLAYTON GREEN FROM INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENTS**

**Resolved –**

**That the petition be referred to the Executive.**

***Note: In noting the receipt of the above recommendation the Leader reported that the petition would be considered at the Executive on 10 October 2017***

**2. Regeneration & Economy Overview & Scrutiny Committee  
25 July 2017 TOURISM CONSULTATION UPDATE**

**Resolved –**

**That the views expressed by the Regeneration and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee be shared with the Executive.**

***Note: In noting the receipt of the above recommendation the Leader reported that the views of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee were referred to in the report on the Destination Management Plan and Future delivery of frontline visitor information (Document “R)***

**3. Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee 8 August 2017  
COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT**

**Resolved –**

**(1) That this Committee requests that the Executive makes a decision on the model of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme for Bradford and to review the effectiveness of the model in two years.**

**(2) That this Committee requests that the Executive takes into account the comments raised by Members in the development of the new Council Tax Reduction Scheme, including the consideration of a Hardship Scheme.**

***Note: In noting the receipt of the above recommendations the Leader reported that they would be considered at the Executive on 10 October 2017.***

## REGENERATION, PLANNING & TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO

*(Councillor Ross-Shaw)*

### 28. CITYCONNECT 2 - BRADFORD CANAL ROAD CORRIDOR CYCLEWAY SCHEME (MOVING TRAFFIC) ORDER AND (WAITING LOADING AND PARKING) ORDER - OBJECTIONS

The report of the Strategic Director Place (**Document “M”**) considered objections to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the proposed CityConnect 2 - Bradford Canal Road Corridor Cycleway scheme.

The Leader referred to a letter that had been received from the Director of Uriah Woodhead & Sons dated 8 September 2017, which had been circulated to members of the Executive and noted that a detailed reply would be sent which would address the points raised in the letter. Photographs which were also submitted were circulated to members at the meeting.

The Strategic Director Place introduced the report and outlined the background to the scheme, the approval of the scheme at Executive on 20 September 2016 and the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders between 17 February 2017 and 10 March 2017. He referred to the summary of objector’s concerns and officer comments contained in Document “M”.

An objections report was considered by the Bradford East Area Committee on 11 July 2017. The Area Committee resolved:

- i) that the Committee recognises and welcomes the cycle link*
- ii) that the Committee is not content that the solution offered is a safer, more attractive urban environment that will make the positive contribution to Bradford’s cycling ambition. The Committee also recognises the challenges of the current site.*
- iii) that officers are asked to fully investigate an alternative scheme in the urban green space alongside Valley Road, Bradford.*
- iv) that the consultation be extended to include people who work along Valley Road, Bradford, and whether they had access to the Cycle to Work scheme.*
- v) that the decision to overrule the objections be delayed until the above work is undertaken and presented to the Committee.*

This decision was subsequently called-in by the Environment and Waste Management Overview & Scrutiny Committee. On 25 July 2017 the Environment and Waste Management Committee resolved:

- i) that this Committee notes a) Paragraph 12.14 of Part 3E of the Constitution of the Council, which states that “area committees may not make a decision which affects, in a significant way, another area without first obtaining the agreement of the area committee for that area”, b) that part of the Bradford Canal Road Corridor Cycleway Scheme is located in the City Ward and therefore falls under the purview of the Bradford West*

- Area Committee; and c) that the Bradford West Area Committee has not been involved in this decision-making decision process so far.*
- ii) that this Committee notes that the Executive resolved on 20 September 2016 that “any valid objections to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders, traffic calming, crossing facilities and cycle tracks be submitted to the Executive” and that this action has not yet been implemented as required.*
  - iii) that this Committee refers the decision back to the Bradford East Area Committee for further consideration of the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders in accordance with the resolution of the Executive dated 20 September 2016.*
  - iv) that this Committee recommends that the Bradford East Area Committee refers this matter with its comments to the Executive for decision when it meets on 14 September 2017, according to the provisions of Paragraph 12.15 of Part E of the Constitution of the Council (which states that “an area committee or two or more area committees jointly may refer a matter in relation to an executive function to the Executive for decision”).*
  - v) that, in the event that the Bradford East Area Committee does not refer this matter to the Executive for decision on 14 September 2017, this Committee recommends that the Executive determines this matter instead in accordance with Paragraph 12.16 of Part 3E of the Constitution of the Council (which states that “the Executive may require a matter in relation to an executive function due to be considered by an area committee to be determined by itself, in which case the delegation of that matter to the area committee shall cease to apply”).*
  - vi) that this Committee notes, in any case, that the Executive has the option of determining this matter when it next meets on 12 September 2017 in accordance with Paragraph 12.16 of Part 3E of the Constitution of the Council and the Executive’s own resolution of 20 September 2016.*

The Strategic Director summarised the risk management and governance issues as set out in paragraph 5 of Document “M” and the options set out in paragraph 9.

The Director of Uriah Woodhead & Son attended the meeting to represent a number of businesses located on Hillam Road. He referred to the letter that he had submitted and Leader confirmed that he would receive a full response. He stressed the need for assurances that alternatives had been explored. He referred to the photographs that he had submitted. He asked how the proposals allowed access for HGV’s to businesses on Hillam Road and Valley Road. He contended that the roads were being designed purely for cyclists and not industry, in an employment and industrial area. He added that if the Orders were implemented this would be damaging for businesses and asked if the Council could demonstrate that it would not. He was of the opinion that If the answer to this was no then another route should be considered. He pointed out that the combined businesses paid rates of £1bn per year and that the Council was wilfully damaging businesses and putting cyclists at risk in an industrial zone. He stressed the collective strong objection to the scheme from businesses. He questioned the safety of the scheme in an industrial zone. He asked whether the Council had included people who work along Valley Road in the consultation and whether they had access to the cycle to work scheme. He asked why Bradford East Area Committee was not involved in the decision making as the scheme straddled both Bradford East and Bradford West. He added that the project would wilfully damage business and suggested that he should pursue the Council

for compensation. He asked whether the Council could demonstrate why the cycle route should be on Valley Road and not Midland Road and asked whether it was because of the refuse vehicles that used Midland Road. He questioned putting local businesses to great expense to benefit cyclists and also questioned the safety of cycling through an industrial zone. He stressed that the businesses had contributed a combined 300 years of business rates to the economy of Bradford. He added that the proposals were contrary to the aims of the Council to improve employment levels in the district which were below national levels. He reported that one business had relocated from Hillam Road to Geldard Road in Leeds. He concluded by questioning whether the scheme was fit for purpose.

The Chair of b-Spoke attended the meeting and pointed out that this route was one of the core routes in the Cycle Strategy that dated back to 2009. She was aware of a number of good cycle routes which went through industrial zones and referred to one in particular in Sheffield. She referred to the closure of the Shipley Job Centre and that this would provide a key route into Bradford for people in transport poverty.

A member of b-Spoke attended the meeting and stated that cyclist and cycling were not anti business and that they needed to find ways of co-existing. He added that the route had existed for a number of years and was an advisory cycle route which would be improved in the City Connect2 scheme. He referred to the Core Plan and specifically additional housing at Bolton Woods and the importance of looking at alternatives to the car. He added that City Connect2 was to encourage people who did not cycle to access work, school and leisure activities. He noted that consultation on the scheme had started in 2015 and that the response was reasoned and considered. He paid tribute to the Council's engineers who had shown ambition and coming to a reasonable compromise which would benefit the health and wellbeing of Bradford.

In response to the question regarding consultation with Bradford West Area Committee, the City Solicitor noted that when considering the issue Bradford East could have requested that it also be considered by Bradford West Area Committee. The Regeneration, Planning and Transport Portfolio Holder added that as a city centre strategic issue this would normally have been considered by the Executive rather than the Bradford West Area Committee.

The Strategic Director confirmed that the pre-scheme consultation with businesses on Valley Road included hand delivering letters to businesses on 10 December 2015 and 5 January 2016 followed by a phone call or site visit. Following this certain aspects of the design changed. Between 4 July and 29 July 2016 2,000 letters were delivered to businesses and residents along the route, a consultation leaflet was enclosed and public consultation events were held. A low number of responses were received, experience had shown that unless people had a specific concern response rates would be low.

The Strategic Director referred to consideration that had been given to an alternative route via Midland Road and Hamm Strasse which would result in a longer, indirect route and introduce a steep hill. He added that a segregated cycle track along Hamm Strasse would require space to be taken from the carriageway which would reduce traffic capacity and an alternative route along Canal Road. Consideration had also been given to an alternative route along

Canal Road but was disregarded due to the adverse effect on the traffic capacity of Canal Road and lack of feasible solutions for crossing numerous side roads and accesses along the route.

In response to a question from the Leader as to whether consideration had been given to the issue of cyclists using an industrial area the Strategic Director noted that Valley Road was quieter than Canal Road and Hamm Strasse and on a level gradient that would encourage more people to use the route.

The Regeneration, Planning and Transport Portfolio Holder stressed that the scheme had been consulted on widely with 2,000 letters, drop in events and face to face consultations. He added that where it had been possible to be flexible, amendments had been made. External consultants had put forward the proposed route which was assessed by the Council. He noted that this was the best route, while acknowledging that there were issues. He stressed the benefits to health and safety, air quality and improved green infrastructure. Officers had been asked to reassess the route, however the width of the road and route had to conform to Government guidelines.

The Leader referred to the risk management and governance issues contained in the report and the need to consider the matter of urgency.

The Regeneration, Planning and Transport Portfolio Holder agreed with the officer assessment that if the scheme was not delivered on time and to budget there would be a risk of damage to the Council's reputation with the Government, West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA) and the general public in its ability to deliver major infrastructure projects. He added that this was the third Council body to look at this issue in the Council's democratic process. He stressed that the tender period had passed and if the Council had to retender this could put the scheme in jeopardy. He added that there was a possibility that WYCA may re-allocate the funding to other schemes. He referred to the possible reputational issue with WYCA and the Government in demonstrating that the Council is able to deliver the project.

The Leader stressed that time was of the essence and that the finance allocated to the scheme had to be spent or it would be lost to this authority. She emphasised the need to take action urgently.

The City Solicitor advised that based on what officers had set out it appeared that the urgency criteria was met. The test being if the decision was not exempt from call-in the delay would be prejudicial to the Council's financial affairs.

The Leader noted that if the decisions were not exempted from call-in this issue may not be resolved until the 7 November 2017 meeting of the Executive. The Regeneration, Planning and Transport Portfolio Holder added that the Council may have had to retender which would delay the process until the new year and would raise issues regarding the delivery of the scheme.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the objections be overruled and the (moving traffic) Traffic Regulation Order be sealed and implemented as advertised for the reasons stated in Paragraph 2.8.1 of Document “M”.**
- (2) That the objections be overruled and the (waiting loading and parking) Traffic Regulation Order be sealed and implemented as advertised for the reasons stated Paragraph 2.8.2 of Document “M”**
- (3) That the objectors be informed accordingly.**
- (4) That it is resolved that resolutions 1 and 2 meet the urgent decision criteria as set out at Paragraph 8.7.4 of Part 3 of the Council’s Constitution. The reasons for urgency are detailed at paragraph 9.6 of Document “M”. In summary, that any delay resulting from a call-in may be prejudicial to the Council’s financial affairs and cause reputational damage should the Council fail to complete the scheme in time and on budget.**

Environment & Waste Management Overview & Scrutiny Committee  
ACTION: Strategic Director Place

## **ENVIRONMENT, SPORT & CULTURE PORTFOLIO**

*(Councillor Ferriby)*

### **29. OUTCOME OF THE PROCUREMENT FOR WASTE TREATMENT SERVICES**

The Strategic Director Place submitted a report (**Document “N”**) the purpose of which was to inform the Executive of the outcome of the procurement for waste treatment services, following a detailed evaluation of bid submissions by the project team.

All Officers involved were thanked for their dedication in delivering the project.

**Resolved -**

**That the outcome of the procurement for waste treatment services be noted for information.**

Environment and Waste Management Overview & Scrutiny Committee  
ACTION: Strategic Director Place

## LEADER OF COUNCIL & CORPORATE

*(Councillor Hinchcliffe)*

### 30. **UPDATED 2017-18 BUDGET ASSESSMENT**

Following the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Financial Position update to the Executive on 11 July 2017, the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Strategic Director Corporate Services (**Document “O”**) detailed the steps being taken to get the budget back on plan.

It was reported that the service areas with the highest levels of savings at risk were Health and Wellbeing and Children’s Services. The Leader of the Council had determined that a formal group (“Star Chamber”) meet with Strategic Directors of Health & Wellbeing and Children’s Services to suggest ways that the budget proposals could be brought back on track.

The Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder referred to the challenges faced due to increasing demand for Children’s services and Health and Wellbeing services and commended the thorough process undertaken in the “Star Chamber”. She noted that in addition to the actions agreed which were referred to in the report the possibility of sharing services with other authorities was being explored.

The Strategic Director Health and Wellbeing reported that a forensic line by line analysis of the budget had been undertaken at weekly meetings. She added that the Council was working with partners in Health, bringing together all the key people in a challenging process. She noted that there had been a lot of activity and support from other areas of the Council.

#### **Resolved-**

**That the contents of Document “O” and the actions taken to manage the forecast overspend be noted**

Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee

ACTION: Chief Executive/Strategic Director Corporate Services

### 31. **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION CORPORATE PEER CHALLENGE REVIEW FINDINGS AND IMPROVEMENT ACTION PLAN 2017**

Bradford Council invited the Local Government Association (LGA) to undertake an independent Corporate Peer Challenge review, which took place in March 2017. The report of the Chief Executive (**Document “P”**) detailed the areas the review looked at, its findings and the Council’s response in the form of an Improvement Action Plan.

The Director of Corporate Services noted that the peer Review provided reassurance while identifying key areas where the Council needed to do more. He added that the actions in the Improvement Action Plan had been embedded and a return visit would be required by March 2018 to ensure that the actions had been implemented.



**Resolved -**

- (1) That the Corporate Peer Challenge review Improvement Action Plan be agreed.**
- (2) That Governance arrangements through the Council Plan Outcome Delivery Board be approved.**

Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee

ACTION: Chief Executive

**32. LOCAL PLAN - BRADFORD DISTRICT WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT - PLANNING INSPECTORS REPORT & ADOPTION**

The Council was in the process of preparing a new Local Plan which would replace the current statutory development plan for Bradford District (the Replacement Unitary Development Plan) which was adopted in 2005. The first of the Local Plan documents was the Core Strategy which was adopted at meeting of Full Council on 18 July 2017. The Waste Management Development Plan Document (DPD) set out the planning framework for managing the District's waste in a sustainable manner. It included policies and allocations for the management of waste in line with the national waste strategy and relevant European regulations. It dealt with all types of waste including Local Authority Collected Waste. The DPD was approved by Full Council on 20 October 2015 for submission to government for examination. Following publication for representations an examination was held with a government appointed Inspector. Council had now received the Planning Inspector's Final Report and recommendations on the Bradford District Waste Management DPD, which formed part of the Local Plan.

The Inspector had considered all the matters before him including the plan, the evidence underpinning it, and the objections and representations made and the published modifications. In his report he concluded that the Bradford District Waste Management Plan could be considered to be legally compliant and sound, providing a limited set of Main Modifications were made to the plan, as submitted.

The Strategic Director Place submitted a report (**Document "Q"**) which presented the Planning Inspector's Final Report and recommendations on the Bradford District Waste Management DPD, which formed part of the Local Plan. The purpose of the report was for the Executive to note the contents of the Inspector's report and to seek authority to proceed to Full Council to request the legal adoption of the modified Bradford District Waste Management Plan in line with the Inspector's recommendation.

The Regeneration, Planning and Transport Portfolio Holder commended the Waste Management DPD that specified how the district managed its waste sustainably.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the contents of Document “Q” and contents of the Inspector’s Report (Appendix 1 to Document “Q”) be noted and it be recommend that Full Council formally adopt the Bradford District Waste Management Development Plan as approved by Full Council on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2015 and submitted to the government for examination with the Main Modifications contained in Appendix 2, as proposed by the Inspector pursuant to Section 23 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.**
- (2) That the Assistant Director (Planning Transportation and Highways) in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder be authorised to make other minor amendments of redrafting or of a similar nature as may be necessary prior to formal publication.**

Environment & Waste Management Overview & Scrutiny Committee  
ACTION: Strategic Director Place

### **33. BRADFORD DISTRICT HOUSING ALLOCATIONS POLICY 2017**

The Housing Act 1996 required local authorities to maintain and publish a formal social housing allocations policy. The report of the Strategic Director Place (**Document “S”**) presented a revised policy for the District of Bradford.

The Regeneration, Transport and Planning Portfolio Holder thanked officers for their work in producing the revised policy and noted that it had been widely consulted on and had received support from the Regeneration and Economy Overview & Scrutiny Committee and the Armed Forces Champion.

The Strategic Director reported that officers were looking to make system changes to remind applicants of the requirement to re-register every 12 months.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the Housing Allocations Policy be approved as set out in the Appendix to Document “S”.**
- (2) The delegated authority be granted to the Strategic Director Place in consultation with the relevant Portfolio holder to implement and monitor the Housing Allocations Policy, including agreeing the ‘Go Live’ Date, and, during the lifetime of the policy, to make any necessary amendments as required at the appropriate time, provided such changes do not fundamentally alter the policy principles on which this policy is based.**
- (3) That delegated authority be granted to the Strategic Director of Place in consultation with the Portfolio Holder to consider and introduce any changes to the IT system and methodology to improve the allocation of housing within the District.**

**34. BRADFORD CULTURE UPDATE INCLUDING SUPPORT TO LEEDS BID TO BE EUROPEAN CAPITAL OF CULTURE 2023.**

The report of the Strategic Director Place (**Document “T”**) provided an update on Bradford’s Strategic Framework for Culture, this included information on the investment into the district from Arts Council England.

Approval was also sought from Bradford District Metropolitan Council to provide a letter of support to Leeds City Council as they bid to be European Capital of Culture in 2023, this would form part of the submission and deadline in October 2017.

The Environment, Sport and Culture Portfolio Holder noted the strength and diversity of the cultural offer in Bradford, the partnership working and the increased Arts Council funding that had been received. She referred to the benefits to Bradford in supporting the Leeds bid to be capital of culture 2023.

The Leader stressed the importance of the Arts Council relationship with Bradford which had resulted in £7m being allocated to cultural organisations in Bradford. She stressed the importance of Leeds receiving regional support for their bid and wished them every success.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That arts and culture progress to date, the level of external funding through Arts Council England over the next four years into the district and next steps going forward be noted.**
- (2) That Leeds’ bid to be European Capital of Culture 2023 be supported and a letter of support be provided to be included in the submission. That it be noted that the Leeds’ bid presents a significant opportunity for Leeds and the wider region, including Bradford, in terms of cultural, social and economic benefits.**
- (3) That cultural organisations from Bradford be encouraged to be involved in the bid. That it be noted that this bid provides an opportunity to develop a regional brand for the cultural offer and should stimulate more joined up ways of working between local authorities and cultural organisations across the region.**
- (4) That the potential call on regional funds to invest in the delivery of the bid if it is successful be noted.**

### 35. THE DESTINATION MANAGEMENT PLAN AND FUTURE DELIVERY OF THE FRONTLINE VISITOR INFORMATION

The report of the Strategic Director Place (**Document “R”**) was to inform the Executive of the Destination Management Plan (DMP) and Tourism Review reports and consider that the new approach to destination management was the right way forward and agree the delivery model for the Tourism frontline service.

On 25 July 2017 the Regeneration & Economy Overview & Scrutiny Committee considered an update on the Tourism Review and Destination Management Plan (*Regeneration & Economy Document “C”*). The Strategic Director advised members that the Committee was very supportive of the report. The Committee wanted transport networks to be used to showcase the district and the district’s restaurants to be part of the offer. He noted that the food offer was mentioned as a strategic approach to the district. The Committee supported the use of volunteers to promote the district. The positive suggestions made by the Committee had been taken on board in Document “R”.

Councillor Hawkesworth attended the meeting and disclosed an interest in the box office element of the Visitor Information Centres and the Ilkley Summer Festival as a friend of Kings Hall Ilkley. She was in favour of the Ilkley visitor information centre moving to the library and the support from Ilkley Parish Council. She suggested that consideration be given to the future use of the empty visitors centre as a visitor destination itself. The Leader noted that this was not for discussion at today’s meeting and that local ward Councillors would be consulted on the next steps.

The Environment, Sport and Culture Portfolio Holder recognised the changes that had taken place in delivering visitor information and thanked officers and partners from Ilkley Parish Council, the Bronte Society and Shipley College for the constructive way in which they had addressed the issue.

The Leader noted the shift in emphasis on how the service was delivered with a much reduced budget. She thanked Ilkley Parish Council, the Bronte Society and Shipley College in their commitment to provide visitor information and anticipated a similar partnership arrangement for Bradford.

#### **Resolved –**

- (1) That the strategic approach to Destination Management outlined in the DMP report be implemented.**
- (2) That Bradford Visitor Information Centre be kept in its current location until 2019 and partnership opportunities be identified to find future resourcing and delivery options for frontline visitor information, including professional Welcome Ambassadors in Bradford.**
- (3) That a team of Pop up volunteers be developed to meet and greet at key events across the district.**

- (4) That the Bronte Society takes over the lease of the Haworth Visitor Information Centre building and provides a frontline Tourist Information provision for Haworth and Bradford District. The Council consults with them on the TUPE Transfer of current staff.
- (5) That Ilkley Parish Council fund Ilkley Visitor Information Centre and the service moves from the Town Hall into Ilkley Library.
- (6) That Shipley College have a Visitor Information Point in Victoria Hall and direct all emails and phone calls to Bradford Visitor Information Centre.
- (7) That the remaining budget be invested into Tourism development and marketing creating 2 new posts of a Tourism Digital Media Officer and Tourism Officer.

Regeneration & Economy Overview & Scrutiny Committee  
ACTION: Strategic Director Place

**36. MINUTES OF THE WEST YORKSHIRE COMBINED AUTHORITY**

**Resolved -**

**That the Minutes of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority held on 29 June 2017 be received.**

Chair

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

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